DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 024 SP 015 597

AUTHOR	Boardman, Sharon G., Ed.
TITLE	Inservice Programs for Helping Regular Classroom Teachers Implement Public Law 94-142.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 80
NOTE	64p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Handicapped Students: *Inservice Teacher Education: *Mainstreaming: *Special Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Classroom Management: Education for All Handicapped Children Act: Information Analysis Products

ABSTRACT

Presented is a collection of essays reporting on a number of different inservice programs designed to prepare teachers to deal with the requirements of Public Law 94-142, which requires equal education for handicapped students via a mainstreaming approach. Included in each article are names and addresses of contact persons for further information. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181024

Inservice Programs for Helping Regular Classroom Teachers Implement Public Law 94-142

Sharon G. Boardman, Editor

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 616
Washington, DC 20036

February 1980 SP 015 597

SP015597

Other ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education publications on Public Law 94-142 are as follows:

A Selected Annotated Bibliography on PL 94-142: Practical Programs for the Classroom. BETs no. 13. February 1980. SP 015 599.

Teachers Talk: PL 94-142 Reaches the Classroom. February 1978. ED 150 121.

Teachers Prepare For Regular Class Placement of Handicapped Students. Briefly On...Regular Class Placement. No. 2. Occasional Paper, 1978. ED 170 292.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is funded by the National Institute of Education. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to an external referee for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Clearinghouse, or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD v

ADAPTATIONS OF LOFT MODEL

Missouri: Valley Park Inservice Training 1
Illinois: Success Through Individualized Learning Experiences. . . . 5

SERVICE CENTER INSERVICE MODELS

New York: 'Introduction to Mainstreaming'--A Course. 9
Texas: Special Education Professional Development. 12
Texas: Mainstreaming Inservice Project 15

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSERVICE MODELS

New York: Mainstreaming Institute. 21
Alabama: Project HELP. 26
Pennsylvania: Project S.T.R.E.A.M. 30

STATE EDUCATION INSERVICE MODELS

Nebraska: State Education Training Series. 35
New Jersey: Mainstream Inservice Project 40

INSERVICE MODELS FOR SPECIFIC AREAS

Michigan: Mainstreaming Preschoolers 45
Missouri: Adapting Physical Education. 48
Oregon: Training Rural Administrators and Support Personnel. 51
North Carolina: Initial Screening of Children with Special Needs . .55

FOREWORD

By September 1, 1980, all handicapped persons between the ages of three and twenty-one must be identified and be receiving individualized education in least restrictive environments.

That goal, mandated by the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Public Law 94-142), is no small task as was apparent in the monograph Teachers Talk: PL 94-142 Reaches the Classroom. Published by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education in February 1978, the monograph featured six regular and special education teachers discussing various aspects of implementing the federal law. For example, they discussed teachers and administrators' lack of knowledge, but willingness to learn, about the law; the ambiguity surrounding the term "least restrictive environment"; the problems of coordinating the various participants involved in evaluating a handicapped child; the fears, stemming from lack of preparation, of writing individualized education plans (IEPs) for each handicapped child; and the effects on other students of having handicapped children in regular classrooms.

The panel was concerned especially with the need for retraining regular classroom teachers, who ultimately are responsible for the handicapped children placed in their care. The lawmakers obviously had this need in mind when they wrote the rules and regulations for Public Law 94-142. Excerpted from the August 23, 1977, Federal Register 42 (163):42492-93, the rules and regulations for "Comprehensive System of Personnel Development" read as follows:

Scope of System

Each annual program plan must include a description of programs and procedures for the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development which include:

(a) The inservice training of general and special educational instructional, related services, and support personnel;
(b) Procedures to insure that all personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act are qualified...and that activities sufficient to carry out this personnel development plan are scheduled; and
(c) Effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of programs for handicapped children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials developed through those projects....

Inservice Education

As used in this section, "inservice training" means any training other than that received by an individual in a full-time program which leads to a degree.

Each annual program plan must provide that the State educational agency: (1) conducts an annual needs assessment to determine if a sufficient number of qualified personnel are available in the State; and (2) initiates inservice personnel development programs based on the assessed needs of Statewide significance related to the implementation of the Act.

Each annual program plan must include the results of the needs assessment..., broken out by need for new personnel and need for retrained personnel.

The State educational agency may enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, local educational agencies or other agencies, institutions, or organizations (which may include parent, handicapped, or other advocacy organizations), to carry out:
(1) experimental or innovative personnel development programs;
(2) development or modification of instructional materials; and
(3) dissemination of significant information derived from educational research and demonstration projects.

Each annual program plan must provide that the State educational agency insures that ongoing inservice training programs are available to all personnel who are engaged in the education of handicapped children, and that these programs include: (1) the use of incentives which insure participation by teachers (such as released time, payment for participation, options for academic credit, salary step credit, certification renewal, or updating professional skills); (2) the involvement of local staff; and (3) the use of innovative practices which have been found to be effective.

Each annual program plan must:

1. Describe the process used in determining the inservice training needs of personnel engaged in the education of handicapped children;
2. Identify the areas in which training is needed (such as individualized education programs, nondiscriminatory testing, least restrictive environments, procedural safeguards, and surrogate parents);
3. Specify the groups requiring training (such as special teachers, regular teachers, administrators, psychologists, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, physical education teachers, therapeutic recreation specialists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, medical personnel, parents, volunteers, hearing officers, and surrogate parents);
4. Describe the content and nature of training for each area (under 2 above);
5. Describe how the training will be provided in terms of (i) geographical scope (such as Statewide, regional, or local), and (ii) staff training source (such as college and university staffs, State and local educational agency personnel, nonagency personnel);
6. Specify: (i) the funding sources to be used, and (ii) the time frame for providing it; and
7. Specify procedures for effective evaluation of the extent to which program objectives are met.

Personnel Development Plan

> Each annual program plan must: (a) include a personnel development plan which provides a structure for personnel planning and focuses on preservice and inservice education needs; (b) describe the results of the needs assessment...with respect to identifying needed areas of training, and assigning priorities to those areas; and (c) identify the target populations for personnel development, including general education and special education instructional and administrative personnel, support personnel, and other personnel (such as paraprofessionals, parents, surrogate parents, and volunteers).

The following fourteen papers describe inservice programs in eleven states that are helping prepare regular teachers to work with the handicapped children now in their classrooms. Whether these programs were begun to comply with the Act is not known, but they are serving the purpose stated in the Act. These manuscripts were received in response to a Clearinghouse call for papers that was published in the Summer 1979 issue of its Quarterly Information Bulletin.

The Clearinghouse itself made no attempt to evaluate the effectiveness or appropriateness of the different approaches for providing inservice education to regular classroom teachers. However, comments received from reviewers of the manuscripts questioned some of the approaches. Readers are encouraged to study the contents critically.

In general, these papers discuss program operations, governance, funding, replicable successes, unanticipated problems and suggestions for solving them, useful resources, and recommendations for improvement. Every situation is unique in some respect because of different settings and clientele. Thus, attempts to replicate any of these programs will not result in carbon copies, but many ideas can be adopted and adapted. Readers will note that the contents are arranged topically according to provider of inservice training, modifications of one specific model, and several models about specific areas.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is disseminating these papers so that school systems contemplating inservice education on Public Law 94-142 can take advantage of the successes and failures of others. The Clearinghouse gratefully acknowledges the professional contributions of the authors who submitted their manuscripts in response to a call for papers. Comments about this publication and the subject it treats are encouraged.

It is also anticipated that this document may stimulate readers or their colleagues to submit related documents to the Clearinghouse for possible inclusion in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) system. Documents can include inservice project descriptions, curriculum guides, instructional materials, reports of successful classroom techniques, conference speeches, and other kinds of nonjournal material. All materials submitted should pertain to the preparation and continuing intellectual development of education personnel. For details, contact the Senior Information Analyst, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 616, Washington, DC 20036.

SHARON G. BOARDMAN
Editor, ERIC Clearinghouse
on Teacher Education

ADAPTATIONS OF LOFT MODEL

MISSOURI: VALLEY PARK INSERVICE TRAINING

Janet Nemec

Educators today face the seemingly impossible task of providing maximal opportunities for handicapped children in regular as well as special educational settings. The staff of the Valley Park Missouri Elementary School believe that they succeeded in meeting the challenge. They attribute their success to the Valley Park Learning Opportunities for Teachers (LOFT) Training Program, sponsored by the Saint Louis University Teacher Corps Project and the Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas (MINK) Teacher Corps Network.

The first Valley Park LOFT program in the fall of 1976 consisted of two phases: LOFT Training as developed by Barry and Susan Dollar in the early 1970s in Houston, Texas; and use of a model classroom based on that training. A fifth grade teacher, Janet Nemec, and a Teacher Corps intern, Mary Elliott, were provided LOFT training with funds from the MINK Teacher Corps Network.

After completing advanced training, both teacher and intern were certified to provide LOFT training to others. They trained fifteen to thirty volunteers in the school district. The workshop director taught special education concepts in a variety of settings called management systems.

LOFT Training Program

In each management system, participants gained experience in a particular educational approach. The sequence of six management system experiences follows:

Management System I
- Teacher-dominated, authoritarian approach to instruction
- Self-contained classroom setting
- Entire class taught at same time
- Four-hour management system experience

Management System II
- Direct teacher instruction to small groups; other small groups work in learning centers
- Assignment to small learning groups made randomly
- Movement through learning centers and direct teacher instruction on the basis of a predetermined time block
- Four-hour management system experience

Management System III
- Comprehensive, formal test covering workshop content taken by each participant
- New instructional groups formed on the basis of test performance (ability or homogenous grouping)
- Selection and pace of learning experience corresponding to group objectives as revealed on the comprehensive test
- Two-hour management system experience

Management System IV

- Elimination of smaller groups
- Selection and pace of individual participant's learning experiences corresponding to the objectives revealed on comprehensive test
- Short pre- and post-tests used in addition to LOFT test to determine objective mastery
- Two-hour management system experience

Management Systems V and VI

- Procedure same as system IV
- Learning objectives and experiences determined by the individual participant
- In System VI, individuals use correlation cards to identify the location of specific learning concepts

All management systems used special education and behavior management content. Topics included classroom management, reward and punishment, learning style, rate, content, environment, and contracting. Content was sequenced and continuous through the six management systems. At the end of each management system, an assessment of the experience, called "debriefing," was shared by participants. Debriefing allowed the participants to identify the management system components, strengths, and weaknesses. In a final debriefing to assess the entire training process, participants identified the management system(s) at which they were currently working and the system(s) toward which they planned to move. Strategies and timetables for making the desired changes were defined for every participant.

Model Classroom Follow-up

Many training programs have a disadvantage of ending when the workshop, class, or process being used is completed. This could have been true of the Valley Park LOFT workshop had it not been for the follow-up in the elementary school. With financial assistance and moral support from the Saint Louis University Teacher Corps staff and the Valley Park elementary principal (Dr. Mary Menne), an elementary teacher and a LOFT trainer developed a model fifth grade class using the LOFT principles.

A diagnostic-prescriptive teaching approach was used in the model class. Student abilities were assessed with a myriad of teacher-made and commercially produced tests, most of which were criterion-referenced instruments. This testing provided the teacher with specific objectives on which to prescribe the individual student's learning activities. Lessons were taught via learning centers, small groups, one-to-one, and peer-tutoring. The students, who were academically and socially diverse, had been assigned to the class before the decision to model the teaching-learning process after LOFT.

Both before and periodically throughout the program, parents met at the school to discuss the program's approach and progress. The teacher sent occasional newsletters to parents and other staff members on progress and changes occurring in the class. Because of an open-door policy for staff and parents, students frequently found themselves discussing or explaining their learning activities with visitors.

As other staff members began implementing the LOFT program in their classes, they called upon the model classroom teacher for assistance. Most requests sought assistance to adapt existing classroom materials for use in a more individualized learning program.

Since the 1976 Valley Park LOFT program, training has been repeated four times for new staff members and others who did not participate in the original training. LOFT-trained teachers have been assistants in several of the succeeding workshops to earn certification as LOFT trainers. A LOFT kit, which is needed to run the workshops, was borrowed from the Saint Louis University Teacher Corps Project for training after the Valley Park Teacher Corps Project ended. Costs of duplicated materials and workshop housing have been assumed by the school district. Content in the later workshops has emphasized learning principles related to the normal, learning disabled, behavior disordered, educable mentally retarded, and gifted learners, now mainstreamed in the elementary school.

Problems and Solutions

As a result of Public Law 94-142, the Valley Park Elementary School has extensively mainstreamed the learning disabled, educable mentally retarded, and behavior disordered students in the district. The effect of the LOFT program on staff and students in the mainstreamed setting has been significant. Teachers have found that the LOFT training has helped them more effectively meet the needs of all students, particularly those who have been mainstreamed, through individualized instruction.

Mrs. Dora Saalfrank, fourth grade teacher and implementor of a model classroom, believed that the ability to individualize instruction was her key to effective instruction for the mainstreamed child. She found the individualized approach to be especially helpful in maintaining a positive self-concept in the mainstreamed child, particularly educable mentally retarded and behavior disordered children. Although these children do not encounter frustrating academic competition, they experience self-competition in a learning environment that allows them to be active learners. Mrs. Saalfrank noted that the Valley Park LOFT program would not have been as effective for her if she had not been given the assistance of a teacher's aide. At times when an aide was not available, she thought the effectiveness of the model class was significantly decreased.

Dr. Menne reported that when interviewing new staff, she was able to dispel possible fears of the mainstreamed setting by offering the potential employee LOFT training and follow-up. When hiring, Dr. Menne emphasized her desire for staff commitment to individualized instruction and mainstreaming, as supported by the training program. This emphasis has helped prevent a problem of program disintegration due to staff turnover. Dr. Menne further noted that the workshop content was vast and flexible, emphasizing areas of exceptionality with which the participants worked. One content weakness in past training has been lack of emphasis on the behavior disordered child, but the next LOFT workshop will emphasize this topic.

In the fall of 1978, the Valley Park Elementary program for fourth and fifth grades was changed from totally self-contained settings to a departmental setting. This meant that teachers had to revise their learning centers and classroom management approach to fit the new school structure. Because the development of materials and individualized format requires an exorbitant amount of time, the teachers saw this change as a major problem. It meant

that much of the previously developed materials and strategies could no longer be used. For some teachers, it meant that classroom implementation of the program had to begin again.

One teacher suggested using related filmstrips, tapes, and discussions on material development and operational strategies at periodic meetings after school, in addition to continuation of LOFT training and the model classroom. Also, future LOFT workshops will emphasize the individualized approach in departmental as well as self-contained settings.

Dissemination and Continuation

The Saint Louis University Teacher Corps Project also worked with staff members of the L'Ouverture Elementary School in the Saint Louis Public School System. In the fall of 1978, a LOFT workshop was provided jointly for volunteering staff members of L'Ouverture and Valley Park Elementary Schools. During this workshop, Dr. Menne became a certified LOFT trainer by serving as a trainer assistant, which insures continued availability of the program in her district.

Conclusion

The effectiveness of the Valley Park LOFT program in training teachers of mainstreamed children has been credited to the workshop's content flexibility, emphasis on individualized instruction incorporated with special education concepts, and ongoing follow-up procedures that have kept the LOFT teacher training program functioning.

For more information, contact: Dr. Janet Nemec, Department of Education, Saint Louis University, 221 N. Grand Blvd., Saint Louis, MO 63103; or: Dr. Mary Menne, Valley Park School District, 356 Meramec Station Rd., Valley Park, MO 63088.

ADAPTATIONS OF LOFT MODEL

ILLINOIS: SUCCESS THROUGH INDIVIDUALIZED LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Donald J. Baden

STILE--Success Through Individualized Learning Experiences--has served to equip regular classroom teachers with the skills and attitudes required to meet the individual needs of all students in their classrooms. Although identified special education children have been the focus of diagnostic-prescriptive instruction, an individual classroom contains twenty-five to thirty other students, all of whom have unique needs. Their needs can be better met using the techniques developed through the STILE training process.

Individualizing student instruction is not accomplished simply by equipping teachers with a set of cognitive teaching skills, although these skills are important. STILE has been successful because of its focus on affective behaviors of teachers, not just on the requisite cognitive skills that many teachers already possess or can easily obtain.

STILE evolved through a number of steps. Its progenitor was the Behavioral Skills Lab developed in Houston, Texas, in the early 1970s by Barry and Susan Dollar and others. The Dollars refined their system by developing Learning Opportunities for Teachers (LOFT), which focused on the psychological bases for instruction and management. STILE was developed by Rosalie Rhoads and this writer in 1977. Their experiences with classroom teachers led to the controlling premise for STILE, that is, its content had to be readily understood if it was to be used by the regular classroom teacher. Academic and psychological jargon were avoided, and emphasis was on real-life classroom examples. STILE has been used in approximately twenty school districts, mostly in southwestern Illinois with primary focus being on Teacher Corps projects in Madison and East St. Louis, Illinois, and a Title IV-C project in Breese, Illinois. The process has been used with K-12 teachers in all subject areas of a curriculum.

Content and Process

STILE contains two basic components, content and process. The content component includes material structured to develop cognitive skills needed by teachers, and is presented in ten modules that focus on curriculum development, and skills needed to individualize instruction, and on behavior management skills needed in a classroom focusing on individual student needs. While not unique, the material is presented in a manner understandable by any teacher.

The unique STILE process, through which content is presented, assumes that teachers teach as they have been taught and that if teachers are to change their teaching behavior, they must be taught in a different manner. To this end, STILE uses four distinct teaching/management models in which the participants, by role playing, become the students.

STILE begins with a traditional approach in which the teacher directs the learning through use of a lecture and question/answer teaching style. Participants have no choice as to content, environment, style, or rate of learning. The second STILE approach divides the class into heterogeneous

groups in which students are given alternative learning approaches chosen by the teacher. These include learning centers, games, self-instruction, labs, and direct instruction. A third approach models a homogeneously grouped class in which students move at a group rate, but are offered a variety of learning styles. The fourth STILE approach allows students to progress individually through teacher-set objectives, selecting the environment, rate, and style of learning most appropriate to their own needs.

After each model, participants analyze the process used and assess its strengths and weaknesses. No one model is advocated as being the only appropriate approach. Each teacher is expected to follow a system that is consistent with his or her philosophy of teaching. The modeling provides teachers not only with training in the skills needed to meet varied needs, but also with experiential insight into being lectured to, being in a slow group, being left to develop at one's own pace, and being allowed to learn on one's own using a variety of learning styles.

Results

In experiences with more than 400 teachers, the modeling process has resulted in significant behavioral change in participants' classrooms, as the teachers have adopted or adapted the STILE process. STILE emphasizes that all teachers are different and must make their own choices as to what approach or approaches to use. STILE also stresses that curriculum change is slow and involves a great deal of work. At the completion of the training, each participant contracts with the STILE trainer to use the process and develop one part of a curricular area in the classroom. After the training, regular follow-up is required. This involves either a STILE trainer or, preferably, a local district leader, usually a principal or curriculum coordinator who has also completed STILE training. Follow-up includes discussing the progress each teacher is making toward contract completion, answering curriculum development and implementation questions, or responding to any other needs related to the STILE process.

The training part of the STILE process involves ten to twelve hours of instruction completed in two days or over a period of weeks. Follow-up is individually arranged, but should take place on a weekly or biweekly basis.

The developers of the STILE program strongly advocate the development of curricula by the individual teacher. Not only does this approach assure curricula consistent with local needs, but more importantly gives the teacher a sense of curricular ownership in his or her classroom. Curriculum projects of the 60's and 70's consistently failed to succeed throughout a district because they attempted to make curricula "teacher-proof." Curriculum development, while initially time consuming, requires no mystical or complex skills, and personal curriculum development insures greater use of existing materials. This approach does not replace textbooks, but does make the teacher, and not the textbook author, the professional in the classroom. The text becomes the tool, not the master.

Replication and Evaluation

The STILE process is easily replicable after the initial training. Experience has shown that reading the STILE content is insufficient for

teachers to accept the approach. The experience in a variety of classroom settings is crucial in the development of a predisposition to change.

STILE has documented its success in several ways. Participant feedback has rated the training at an average of 4.7 on a 5.0 scale in a wide variety of settings over the past three years. Participants' comments typically have included statements citing STILE as the high point of their educational career. Statistical studies with the Title IV-C project in Breese, Illinois, have shown significant student achievement gains in reading and math in comparison to control districts since the STILE project began. Teacher attitudes and behavior have also changed significantly. Although most often used in elementary settings, STILE has been used in a number of secondary schools with similar positive results.

Because external funding was used to develop the training materials, implementation costs in a school should be minimal as the STILE process uses existing materials. Ideally, released time should be provided to enable teachers to develop materials, but teachers in situations where this time was not available have successfully developed the STILE process. STILE does not require additional expenditures for materials, does not require identical participation by all teachers, and does not involve a long period of preparation before implementation.

One implementation problem in some areas has been a failure to adequately involve and train the building principals. Although their involvement is not absolutely necessary, it has proved to greatly assist implementation and understanding by all involved, especially if the principal becomes active in follow-up procedures.

STILE is hardly a panacea. Its content is neither unique nor unusual, but its training process has resulted in teachers' becoming active participants in their professional lives and in controlling what is taught in their classrooms. STILE will help some teachers to change dramatically and others to change only a little, because teachers, as well as students, are unique individuals.

For more information, contact Donald J. Baden, Associate Dean, School of Education, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Edwardsville, IL 62025.

SERVICE CENTER INSERVICE MODELS

NEW YORK: "INTRODUCTION TO MAINSTREAMING"--A COURSE

Marleigh B. Braun

The East Ramapo School District is part of the large suburban area surrounding New York City. The student population grew rapidly through the 1960s and early 70s, and its then fifteen elementary schools housed many district classes for "special education" as well as some BOCES programs for special children. Often these special children were mainstreamed into the regular classrooms for some part of the school day.

As the 1970s saw general declining enrollments, staff lay offs, and school closings, the problem of mainstreaming became more acute. Teachers with larger classroom enrollments felt anxious at accommodating "special children." Budget cuts removed aides and additional supplies, not to mention all inservice programs previously designed and used to support the teacher in understanding the problems of handicapped children.

With the advent of Public Law 94-142, teacher concern about mainstreaming rose sharply, as was reflected in a needs assessment survey completed in January 1978 by seventy percent of the staff. "Mainstreaming" was selected as one of the top three concerns by elementary school teachers. This survey was part of a proposal for a federally funded Teacher Center in East Ramapo.

Acknowledging a handicapped population of well over 300 students out of 13,500, and reflecting a genuine concern of the staff, the Teacher Center proposal included an inservice program called "Introduction to Mainstreaming." When the proposal was selected for funding in August 1978, the development of this course became a first priority.

Course Objectives

The Teacher Center policy board appointed a classroom teacher to act as coordinator to develop and plan a ten week course on mainstreaming for the elementary classroom teacher. The general objectives were:

1. To provide the elementary classroom teacher with background information about the various areas of exceptionality of handicapped children being mainstreamed.
2. To assist the teacher in writing and implementing individualized education plans for handicapped children.
3. To help the teacher develop skills and techniques that would provide a favorable learning environment for handicapped and nonhandicapped students.

Funds allowed for hiring classroom teachers and other specialists to lead the various sessions, as well as for purchasing a mini-library on mainstreaming to be housed at the Teacher Center.

Description and Requirements

With the help of the local SEIMC director at BOCES, the following course outline was developed:

Session 1 - General introduction to the problem of mainstreaming, including a film following a child through all the steps from special class to full time in a regular class.
Session 2 - Further exploration of the support roles of the special class teacher, resource people, administrators, and parents.
Session 3 - The characteristics of visually and hearing impaired children.
Session 4 - The characteristics of learning disabled children.
Session 5 - The characteristics of physically and developmentally disabled children.
Session 6 - Development of educational diagnosis and writing individual education plans.
Session 7 - Reading for the special child.
Session 8 - Math for the special child.
Session 9 - Behavior management in the classroom.
Session 10- Counseling parents and exploring human relations.

A wide range of talent was tapped to lead the various sessions, including personnel from other school districts in the county, a college professor, a BOCES psychologist, and several classroom teachers. The teachers were especially helpful with practical suggestions to real problems. They were able to suggest games and alternative learning methods, as well as ways to facilitate social adjustment in the classroom. The variety of personnel helped make the course exceptionally interesting.

The course was given on ten consecutive Monday afternoons (one and a half hours each) in the late spring of 1979 at the Teacher Center. To receive inservice credit (an option granted by the school district) the participants chose to complete three of the following:

1. Review one magazine article on mainstreaming.
2. Make a classroom aid for a specific child in your classroom.
3. Develop an IEP for a specific child.
4. Develop a bibliography of children's books about handicapped children for your classroom. Include a sentence or two about each book and its value (if any) to you and your children.
5. Develop a cooperative game to be used by a group of children (including a handicapped child) to reinforce, remediate, or extend a skill in a content area.

Participants received the course with considerable enthusiasm. The sessions on math and reading for the special child were extremely helpful, and in both cases, the concrete materials provided were useful for the teacher with all students. Many teachers showed positive reactions about exploring the equipment available to children with special needs. Even though this equipment was most often used by the resource teacher, the classroom teachers in general had little awareness of these aids before the course.

Some leaders used records, slides, films, and videotapes to illustrate their topics. Only a few used the straight lecture approach. All allowed time for questions and answers, which often proved the most fruitful part

of the sessions. As time allowed, the participants shared articles and books they had found most helpful. However, there never seemed to be enough time for this.

Problems and Solutions

In fact, time itself became the largest drawback. Because the course was an introduction, many teachers often were frustrated by having only one session devoted to each topic. Typical comments included, "We could use ten weeks just on the learning disabled child," or "I had no idea an individualized education plan could be so involved. Where can I learn more about it?"

One projected solution to this problem is to include several mini-sessions (two hours each) in the regular Teacher Center program on topics that lend themselves to further exploration. These would also serve to attract others who had not been able to take the course on mainstreaming.

Evaluation and Results

At the conclusion of the course, participants were asked for written evaluations covering content, method of presentation, question and answer periods, and general suggestions. Almost all comments were superlative. All the participants completed the course, with about half receiving credit. (This was less than anticipated and seemed to demonstrate that inservice credit is not as strong a drawing card as was earlier thought.)

There were two immediate results from the course. The first was a bibliography of children's books about handicapped youngsters. Each entry included the appropriate level of the book and a brief synopsis. This bibliography was duplicated and distributed to all the elementary librarians in the school district. (An earlier spot check of the elementary school libraries had revealed few children's books on handicapped youngsters. The bibliography should help librarians with future ordering.)

Second, a notebook was compiled of all the materials developed for the course. It included the course outline, the objectives, and duplicates of all handouts given to participants by session leaders. This notebook was added to the small but growing mini-library on mainstreaming at the Teacher Center. For less than $200, a nuclear library was begun.

Long-range results are always much more difficult to assess. However, one participant was so enthusiastic, she approached a local rabbi for permission to begin a program of religious studies for hearing impaired youngsters, with an eye toward mainstreaming them into the regular religious study groups. A second teacher developed a particular learning game for a wheelchair-bound child that turned out to be equally effective with another child. One hopes that this kind of consciousness-raising will continue to spread like ripples on a pond.

For more information, contact Marleigh B. Braun, East Ramapo Teacher Center, 461 Viola Rd., Spring Valley, NY 10977.

SERVICE CENTER INSERVICE MODELS

TEXAS: SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Rose Carroll

The Special Education Professional Development Center (SEPDC) offers an inservice program to regular classroom teachers on individualizing instruction for mildly handicapped special education pupils.

SEPDC's premise is that inservice education should demonstrate and model the behaviors and competencies needed by teachers. For two five-day training cycles, teachers are immersed in individualized instruction in the same manner as they are expected to individualize for children. The intensive training cycles are most important to the application of the SEPDC, but necessitate that teachers be released from regular classroom duties for ten days. To lessen the hardship, school districts are reimbursed for the cost of the substitutes.

Program Model and Operations

Curriculum Model. A core curriculum, required of all teachers, fosters the development of skills, knowledge, and attitudes important for teaching handicapped students. The remaining one-third of the curriculum is optional, with training content placed in branching, self-paced modules, because no one instructional procedure can provide optimal learning for all. The whole curriculum is divided into three instructional subsets: orientation, individual study, and follow-up consultation and project at the trainee's school. These correspond to separate times before, during, and after a teacher's SEPDC activities.

Orientation. Teachers receive orientation kits before reporting to the SEPDC. Designed to increase a teacher's awareness of instructional procedures, kits contain materials about core concepts of individualized instruction, federal laws related to the education of handicapped children, and techniques teaching for handicapped students. A teacher's mastery of the orientation materials provides the training staff with baseline measures of skills.

Individual Study. After orientation, a teacher is eligible for admission into the Special Education Professional Development Center to begin two separate five-day periods of individual study. The primary difference between orientation and individual study is that the former requires only verbal demonstrations of concept mastery, and the latter requires verbal and nonverbal demonstrations. The individual study units engage each trainee in individualized simulation exercises that are designed to provide instructor control while shaping new teaching behaviors. In these exercises, the teachers are active participants in the acquisition of new skills, attitudes, and knowledge. They experience each teaching innovation in a wide range of strategies from the perspectives of teacher and learner.

During the first week, thirteen modules are presented that stress individualized instruction in terms of grouping, management, and scheduling. During the second training week, special education concepts are taught. These ten modules stress federal and state guidelines, identification of learning problems, development of individualized education plans, and teaching strategies and techniques. Throughout the training, SEPDC consultants model the classroom management systems used in individualized instruction, such as large group instruction, timed scheduling through centers, individualized prescriptions, and independent study. Thus, the trainees learn by experience about different ways of managing classrooms.

Follow-up Consultation. On returning to their classrooms, teachers complete the third subset of SEPDC curriculum classroom projects and follow-up visits by SEPDC instructors. The projects help the teachers to systematically fit what they have learned into their specific teaching situations. The follow-up visits give them a chance to ask questions and discuss problems. A written report of the classroom project is required if university credit is desired.

University Credit. SEPDC participants have the option of registering for three hours of graduate or undergraduate credit from Incarnate Word College in San Antonio, Texas. The course is listed in the catalog as "Survey of Exceptional Children."

Self-Pacing. Each teacher's progress through orientation, individual study, and the classroom project is self-paced, although both structure and freedom to explore one's interests are built into the same curriculum. Structure is provided by the core concepts and skills and by the modules, but within the modules and in the projects, teachers are given the freedom and support to generate new branching units and demonstrate curriculum mastery.

Evaluation. Because of self-pacing, a criterion-referenced evaluation plan is used rather than a norm-referenced grading system. Criterion-referenced evaluation is a supportive, learner-centered evaluation plan that serves as a model and can be adopted for classroom instruction.

Reinforcement. Presented ideas do not successfully modify teacher behavior unless two conditions are met upon the teacher's return to the school environment: The new ideas must fit the teacher's unique classroom situation and personality, and instructor feedback and support accompanying each effort toward the program's objectives are important, especially as the teacher begins to use the new concepts. Classroom projects are oriented toward providing information and skills in identifying and solving classroom problems. The primary reinforcers for the teacher are the campus principal and the SEPDC staff.

SEPDC monitors each teacher's application of the curriculum after he or she returns to the classroom. The center emphasizes practical teaching skills, and realizes the importance of providing support while teachers successfully put into practice what they have learned. Teachers who complete the SEPDC program return to their schools to serve as models and change agents for their respective faculties.

Governance and Funding

The program is directed by a project manager, who is responsible to the special education coordinator and the instructional services director of the Education Service Center, Region 20 in San Antonio, Texas. With the assistance of Service Center consultants, the project manager leads the training sessions and provides follow-up assistance in the schools.

Funding is a Title VI-D grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Replication

In 1980, the program will be available for replication. The SEPDC is working with the National Inservice Network at Indiana University and the Texas Inservice Network to provide technical assistance to new programs.

Unanticipated Problems and Recommendations for Improvement

Because the training consists of two five-day cycles, teachers have some difficulty in being released from teaching duties. During the second project year, alternatives of summer sessions or one inservice day per month are being offered.

One overlooked aspect in the initial proposal was a need for regular educators and special educators to communicate and interact. The teacher selection should include a team consisting of a regular classroom teacher and a special education teacher from each campus.

During the first year, only elementary teachers were trained. Curriculum is being developed for secondary teachers.

For more information, contact Rose Carroll, SEPDC, 1550 N.E. Loop 410, San Antonio, TX 78209.

SERVICE CENTER INSERVICE MODELS

TEXAS: MAINSTREAMING INSERVICE PROJECT

James T. Mancill

The Regular Education Inservice Project for Training of Teachers, Administrators, and Aides to Provide for the Handicapped Child in the Regular Classroom had its inception during the 1977 school year in compliance with Public Law 94-142. A cooperative program funded by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for inservice training of teachers, administrators, and aides was approved in the summer of 1978.

Advisory Committee

The procedures and model established by the training proposal included the use of an advisory committee to select participants and to guide and assist with the evaluation of the program's progress. The advisory committee involved representatives from each of the four special education programs within the region and representatives from the Region XIX Education Service Center.

Cooperating agencies and institutions in the project were: Region XIX Education Service Center, El Paso Independent School District, Ysleta Independent School District, Bi-County Cooperative (school districts), University of Texas at El Paso, and Texas Education Agency.

Project Model Design

The actual model for working with the schools is a three-year program. Each year ten school campuses are selected as training sites. Each campus sends five participants, the building principal and four teachers. These fifty participants are engaged in a two-phase inservice program. The first phase is a period of intensive workshops on information and knowledge related to education of the handicapped. The second phase provides for a practicum where participants receive on-site assistance from the project team in implementing the practices learned in the workshops. The end goal of the project is that the teachers and principals on project campuses become resources for all teachers on a campus, who need to learn the requirements and techniques for serving a handicapped child in a regular classroom.

Within the three-year period, 150 teachers and administrators will be trained to lead and assist their colleagues. Additional workshops, awareness programs, and training materials will be made available to participants and teachers in the region.

Program Design

Individualized instruction is a mandate of Public Law 94-142, and handicapped students have a special need for this educational strategy. The goal of the mainstreaming inservice project is that teachers acquire the necessary attitudes, skills, and knowledge to carry out their responsibilities under the laws. Project objectives are as follows:

1. The regular educator will have an understanding of the requirements of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, the Texas Policies and Administrative Procedures, and the local plan for educating handicapped children, and that he or she will acquire a positive attitude toward the task.
2. The regular educator will be able to differentiate between various handicapping conditions according to instructional needs.
3. The regular educator will become conversant in formal testing and will demonstrate expertise in informal assessment techniques applicable to a variety of handicapping conditions.
4. The regular educator will be able to assist in writing for the handicapped learner an individualized education plan (IEP), including instructional goals and objectives applicable to the regular classroom setting.
5. The regular educator will be able to participate effectively as a team member with special educators in planning and implementing daily classroom activities and instructional resources for the handicapped learner in the regular classroom.
6. The regular educator will be able to assist in evaluating a child's progress in the IEP, and assist in updating necessary goals.

Cultural and Philosophical Workshop. In the first workshop, administrators and teachers will become aware of the issues of acceptance of a handicapped learner into mainstream education. Issues include perceiving society as a more viable system because of its heterogeneity of membership; understanding the built-in prejudice toward physically and mentally handicapped people by societal institutions; acknowledging the history of repressing handicapped people; and considering the psychological advantages and disadvantages of handicapped students in being active members of the public education system.

Administrator's Role. The administrative audience is composed of central office executives, building principals, and program directors. The administrators' workshop will adhere to the following agenda: overview of serving handicapped students; educational legislation pertaining to placing a handicapped student in a regular classroom; educational models for educating handicapped children in the independent school district; and ramifications of having a handicapped learner as a member of the student body.

Accommodating Specific Handicapping Conditions. Participants in this mainstreaming inservice program are informed about the following specific handicapping conditions: auditory impairment, emotional disturbance, language/learning disability, mild mental retardation, orthopedic handicap, and visual handicap.

A series of speakers, each possessing expertise in one of these exceptionalities, give a two-day inservice workshop. The state definition, eligibility criteria, characteristics, and special considerations for the

particular handicapping condition are described, as are the accommodations necessary for exceptional students to function. For example, administrators learn about sophisticated lighting, construction of ramps, and widening of doorways, three accommodations that they must initiate. Teachers and paraprofessionals learn about seating arrangements, classroom climate, duration of academic presentations, independent travel, verbalization of personal needs, acquisition of unique instructional supplies, and other things that they must initiate.

Assessment Skills Workshop for Teachers. In the didactic phase of assessment skills workshop, the program addresses the following topics: appropriate assessment approaches for handicapped students; modifications of assessment instruments; formal versus informal assessment activities; and strengths and weaknesses of formal and informal assessment for instructional purposes.

In the practicum phase, each teacher is required to assist in composing an assessment plan and rationale; to assist in composing and/or study one videotape recording of an assessment activity; to participate in at least one formal assessment activity if possible (if not, to study available test data and conduct one formal assessment activity on the same handicapped learner, and compare data from each test); and to document instructional needs on the basis of strengths and weaknesses derived from informal and formal assessments of the handicapped learner.

Individualized Education Plan Workshop. The instructional phase of the IEP workshop explains the purpose, construction, content, and format of an individualized education plan. The practicum phase of this skill development training requires that each inservice participant use the data gathered during the assessment training sessions and update the individualized education plan, when appropriate. Each participant guides a handicapped learner through a series of specific instructional activities derived from the goals and objectives in the child's IEP. On completion of the instructional activity, the inservice participant conducts a post-assessment using the same tools as in the pre-assessment.

Instructional Resources Workshop for Teachers. The skill development training on selection and use of appropriate instructional resources for handicapped children in the regular classroom introduces resources for teaching language arts, mathematics, social sciences, and natural sciences.

A large-group presentation focuses on the classifications of instructional resources: mono-modality resources (cassette tape, filmstrip, book); dual-modality resources (tape, filmstrip, book and tape); and multi-modality resources (kits). From these resources, participants develop and implement small-group and large-group presentations.

Daily Activities Workshop for Teachers. In the didactic phase of the daily activities training session, the concepts of individualized instruction are joined with the skills of interpreting an individualized education plan. Teachers learn to identify daily instructional activities appropriate for the handicapped learner in the regular classroom.

Each participant may produce a videotape recording, solely for self-study, in which he or she instructs a handicapped learner in a regular classroom, using specific goals and objectives in that student's individualized education plan. Incorporated into this self-critiqued videotape may be the following

teacher competencies: identification and use of a variety of instructional resources; implementation of alternative group compositions; and demonstration of a variety of instructional activities that address the same sequential instructional objectives.

Evaluation Process Workshop for Teachers. In the final skill development training component, the following topics are addressed via large-group instruction: the role of post-assessment as a means of identifying student progress in the individualized education plan; the impact of instructional resources on the learner's success; the advantages and disadvantages of various instructional activities to a learner's success; the consequences of grouping and physical environment on a learner's success; and the psychological needs of a learner and their impact on instructional success.

Criterion-referenced versus norm-referenced tests, teacher-made tests, observational techniques, and continuous progress grading may be incorporated into the evaluation process workshop.

Application of these skills is demonstrated by the inservice participant's contribution to updates of a learner's IEP.

Supervised Learning for Teachers

The mainstreaming inservice project provides a balanced program via regularly scheduled workshops, seminars, individual case consideration, laboratory experience with children, microteaching, and sensitivity training. Teachers may earn three semester hours of university credit through the University of Texas at El Paso by completing the training program.

Beginning in August before school starts, participants encounter the following subject matter through seminars and inservice training: culture and philosophy; specific handicapping conditions; assessment skills; IEP development and follow-up; individualization of instruction; instructional resources; daily activity; evaluation process; communication skills; parent involvement; individualized need; and classroom management.

Administrators, teachers, and their aides, on request, are visited regularly by a regional team of the project specialist and the demonstration teacher. On-site assistance is provided by the team and feedback is channeled into workshop and inservice training sessions, where needed for additional emphasis. Local school personnel contribute to evaluation and follow-up of the program and assist with training all faculty members on their campuses.

Results

The mainstreaming inservice project provides teachers with the following competencies to work with handicapped children in regular classes: (a) development of psychological and sociological insights into educational problems of a handicapped pupil; (b) knowledge of learning style dynamics of a minimally handicapped pupil; (c) development of skills in use of existing and special resource materials for teaching a handicapped individual; (d) knowledge of effective classroom correctional techniques for use with handicapped students; and (e) effectiveness in carrying on constructive dialogue with colleagues, parents, diverse community and private social agencies, and other groups or individuals.

For additional information contact: Dr. James T. Mancill, Project Director, Region XIX Education Service Center, P. O. Box 10716, El Paso, TX 79997.

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSERVICE MODELS

NEW YORK: MAINSTREAMING INSTITUTE

Linda Biemer

On the belief that regular classroom teachers must have the assistance and cooperation of special education teachers and a district's support service personnel as well as the backing of the building principal to effectively implement mainstreaming, the State University of New York at Binghamton developed a year-long Mainstreaming Institute to train teams of regular and special educators.

Participants and Goals

Each school building team is made up of the principal, a regular class teacher, a special class teacher, and a representative from the support services personnel (school nurse, psychologist, guidance counselor, reading specialist, etc.) or a second regular teacher. The Institute coordinators, too, are a similar team of two regular teacher educators--one in secondary education, the other an elementary specialist--and a special education teacher educator.

The Institute's goal each twelve months is to provide twenty participants with knowledge, skills and positive attitudes about mainstreaming, so that each team of four, in turn, can develop inservice training programs in their school districts. Before the Institute began, letters announcing the program were sent to chief school officers in each of the eleven districts the university serves. Superintendents were requested to forward the announcements to the proper administrators within their jurisdictions. Although building principals were charged with forming a team, often the teachers themselves initiated the faculty commitment. It is recommended that an Institute staff member meet with each superintendent to explain the project, answer questions, and clarify misunderstandings that might arise over district commitment, superintendent's responsibility, and team selection.

Each year the Institute staff selects five teams. Only one team from a district is chosen, and the project staff attempts to assemble a good mix of participants: vocational and academic educators, teams from primary, middle, and high schools; teams from rural, urban, and suburban schools; experienced and inexperienced teachers; and females and males.

Program Design and Content

The year long Institute has two parts: an intensive, all-day, four-week summer unit, and bimonthly seminars during the following fall and spring semesters. Each participant receives a $750 stipend, of which $75 is paid for each of the four summer weeks, and $50 is paid every month during the academic year. Stipends are funded by the university graduate school of education's regular education inservice grant from the Bureau of Education

for the Handicapped, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In addition to stipends, participants are enrolled as non-matriculated graduate students and can earn twelve graduate credits, gratis, at the university. During the summer, staff also are funded by the grant, but during the academic year, the Institute is considered a teaching overload for the three staff members, who are also school of education faculty. Additional school of education contributions are secretarial assistance, space, and postage.

The summer session begins with emphasis on the theoretical aspects of mainstreaming. Affective and cognitive pretests on mainstreaming are administered the first day of class. Pretest results from the project's first two years indicate that most of the educators already had positive leanings toward mainstreaming. "I wouldn't be here if I didn't!" one teacher reminded the staff. However, the cognitive test revealed misinformation as well as general lack of knowledge about special education terminology, procedures for special class and mainstreamed placements, and federal and state legislation.

Informal lecture-discussions by project staff and local educational specialists, audiovisual materials,* and activities from the kit Mainstreaming Mildly Handicapped Students in the Regular Classroom** provide the structure for studying the laws, legal procedures, handicapping conditions, and abilities of students with particular disabilities. Assisted by the other two staff members, the special education teacher educator lectures and leads discussions on the five major categories of handicaps (emotionally disturbed--ED; learning disabled--LD; educable mentally retarded--EMR; trainable mentally retarded--TMR; and physically handicapped--PH). He also devotes a day to examining the different kinds of tests used in districts to ascertain a child's abilities and disabilities. Participants often discuss with the staff their particular students and others in their school. In addition, case studies are examined, and from the data in each, teams determine an appropriate educational placement for each case study child and write hypothetical individualized education plans. Because the staff's combined expertise is limited to mental and emotional disabilities, area teachers of physically handicapped, blind, and deaf children are featured presenters. These public school teachers work with mainstreamed children and with both regular and special teachers. Also, the director of special education for the regional special ed center meets with the group one afternoon to explain the local applications and effects of federal and state laws mandating education for all handicapped children.

Local schools, community agencies, and programs for handicapped children furnish settings for four field trips. The teams inspect a summer physical education program that includes swimming, arts, crafts, and cooking instruction, and serves mostly physically handicapped children from ages five to twenty-two. At a psychiatric center, classes for emotionally disturbed adolescents are observed, as are students in an early childhood handicapped program. The Institute group also visits a community hospital clinic that specializes in early detection and treatment of handicaps, beginning with

---

*A list of materials may be obtained from the author.

**In three parts--Introducing Mainstreaming, Data Banks, and Implementing Mainstreaming--this kit is available from the Education Service Center, Region XIII, 6504 Tracor Lane, Austin, TX 78704. The cost is $375.

newborn infants. Because of a need for more than observation, the teams also meet with handicapped adults who relate their childhood experiences in special and regular classrooms. Not being able to see mainstreaming in operation in regular classrooms because schools are closed during the summer is one serious shortcoming of the Institute. However, the school buildings themselves are scrutinized after a state education department architect shows slides of both the various architectural barriers in many school buildings and improvements required by federal law.

On the belief that more individualization of instruction for all students in the regular classroom is needed to successfully implement mainstreaming, one Institute staff member spends a morning helping teachers learn how to modify their curricular materials for successful individualization. In addition, the participants can use materials from the teacher training kit developed at the Education Service Center in Austin, Texas. By working through the kit's data banks on concepts or skills, the teachers and administrators are able to refine their techniques and acquire new ones for individualizing instruction. The eight concepts or skills are assessment/evaluation, communication, curriculum, grading/reporting, influencing behavior, instructional management, learning environment, and learning styles.

Interwoven with the lecture-discussions, field trips, and training kits are films, cassette-filmstrips, videotapes, and slide-tape sets depicting the history of handicappism, the lives of successful handicapped persons, and successful mainstreaming in practice. These audiovisual materials are either owned by the university, borrowed from regional or state AV centers at no charge, or rented or purchased from commercial film companies. Books, pamphlets, journals (The Directive Teacher, Education Unlimited, the Council for Exceptional Children Journal), and articles and bulletins from state and federal departments of education for the handicapped are always available for participant perusal and loan. These materials continue to be accessible to the participants as they develop and carry out inservice training programs in their respective districts.

Institute Results

Time for planning inservice programs is allotted during the last few days of the summer session. Early in the Institute, each team meets with its superintendent to assess the team's role in any district inservice plan. If there is no plan, the team seeks permission to initiate one, either for their school, or for several or all schools in the district. The proposals developed by each team have varied according to district administration receptiveness and team creativity. In the last summer class, teams present their inservice ideas for constructive comment.

Before the school year starts, district inservice education begins. One Institute team had complete charge of the 1979-80 opening day orientation for all teachers. Another team had received the go-ahead to plan two inservice days on mainstreaming. Other teams "sell" their inservice proposals to individual schools throughout the year. Some present after-school workshops; others service teachers at one faculty meeting a year in each school and hold follow-up sessions with the more interested teachers. One team offered its workshop to two school districts that had not been involved in either year's Institute. The Institute staff members attend as many inservice

sessions as possible, either as speakers, supporters, observers, critics, or all four. Most teams use materials from the Institute, and solicit some of the same guest speakers.

Additional guest speakers meet with the Institute participants during fall and spring follow-up seminars. Many of these speakers were unable to attend during the summer; others are specialists whose expertise was not needed until teams found themselves unable to answer questions or solve problems within their schools. For example, the regional associate from the special education division of the state education department met with a group to keep them abreast of changes on the state level, and to provide them with an update on state compliance with Public Law 94-142. A local pediatrician, who specializes in treating children diagnosed as hyperactive or emotionally disturbed, discussed the role of medications and those children. The parent point of view was sought, and parents of handicapped children related their fears, disappointments, and successes with mainstreaming. Realizing a need to improve their communication skills with students, parents, and even other teachers, the participants invited in a certified instructor of teacher effectiveness training.

Teachers who were effectively mainstreaming in their classes and teachers who had successfully individualized instruction for their regular students also spoke to the class. Part of each class session is reserved for a sharing of district teams' inservice efforts. Often participants provide other teams with ideas for speakers, loan newly acquired materials, or demonstrate an activity they have successfully developed and used in their inservice efforts. The 1978-79 Institute members collectively sponsored after school a six-hour countywide conference on mainstreaming. This workshop was well-attended by teachers who had missed other workshops and teachers who had been given no inservice instruction in mainstreaming by their school administration.

The school administrations that sent teams to the Institute recognize the project's value--staff expertise. Armed with their SUNY Binghamton Certificate in Mainstreaming, some Institute participants have found themselves the acknowledged leaders in both mainstreaming and inservice training in their district. Two teams not only have been placed on their district's inservice committee, but actually dominate it. For two consecutive years, that school district has received sizeable state funds for inservice education, which it used for a series of fifteen after school voluntary mainstreaming workshops. Thirty-five teachers received district inservice credit as a result. Another team was granted money to train all vocational educators within the regional vocational high school.

Evaluation

The posttests administered at the ends of the summer session and the year-long program indicate that Institute participants have acquired a vast theoretical and practical background in mainstreaming, and many ideas for effective implementation. The success of the teams' inservice efforts is demonstrated by the large attendance at the countywide conference, the demand for more such workshops, and by the increasing number of area teachers and administrators interested in the Institute itself. Interest is so great that the staff is seeking additional federal funding from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to broaden the region served.

Another reason for the model's success is an unexpected cooperative spirit that developed among the teams during the summer and that grows in intensity as they continue to meet. From their Institute experiences, the administrators, many of whom had been away from the regular classroom for several years and all of whom had little training in special education, have developed a deeper appreciation for all of their teachers; the special and regular educators have learned to respect each other's expertise; and all teachers and support service personnel have perceived different views of the principal's role and of the restrictions imposed on building administrators. The Institute staff think that they, too, are contributing to the implementation of successful mainstreaming within the area the university serves.

For more information, contact Linda Biemer, Assistant Professor, Programs in Professional Education, State University of New York at Binghamton, Binghamton, NY 13901.

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSERVICE MODELS

ALABAMA: PROJECT HELP

Larry L. Martin

If a child is labeled "learning disabled," "mentally retarded," or "emotionally disturbed," a teacher has only a general idea of the specific learning problems this child might have. For years such children have frustrated classroom teachers. Teachers have no problem identifying children who have trouble learning, but they do have extreme difficulty in helping these problem children learn to the best of their abilities.

Project Design

Three distinct, but interrelated, components of Project HELP (resulting in a 250-page learning packet, HELP for Educating Exceptional Children in the Classroom) were developed to answer the three questions most frequently asked by teachers who work with exceptional children in the regular classroom.

1. How can I pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses of a child and determine what his or her needs are?

   Section A of the HELP packet includes a checklist for identifying students with learning problems, definitions and explanations of problems that students commonly encounter, highlights of strengths and weaknesses, signals to look for, techniques to use, and sources of material.

2. How can I possibly deliver what a special child needs when I have twenty-five or more other students in my classroom at the same time?

   Section B of the HELP packet describes effective classroom structures for differentiated instruction. Such things as grouping patterns, modes of instruction, scheduling, record keeping, individualizing, contracting, packets, learning centers, learning styles, and student attitudes are examined.

3. How can I manage individual and classroom behaviors when I start individualizing and differentiating my instruction?

   Section C of the HELP packet explains how classroom management techniques can be used to deal effectively with behavior problems. Ten case histories are presented including case management and results. Such things as recording techniques, graphing, reinforcers, punishment, and specific techniques are discussed.

The HELP packet is designed for use in conjunction with eighteen to twenty-four hours of guided inservice training. Each teacher is required to

identify a child with learning problems and to carry out the project assignments within his or her classroom. Such an approach ensures keen interest, immediate relevance, and sustained practice with support from the project personnel.

Funding, Staff, and Participants

Project HELP was originated and has been continued as a result of two different special Deans' Grants, funded in part by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The original grant, which is in its fifth year, was written and co-directed by this author and funded through the School of Education at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas, during the 1974-75 school year. In 1977, another BEH Dean's Grant was written by this author and funded through the School of Education at Auburn University at Montgomery, Montgomery, Alabama. Both grants were designed to develop effective means of educating preservice and inservice teachers in handling exceptional children in the regular classroom.

The project staffs at both universities were similar and consisted of two project co-directors, two graduate assistants, and a secretary. A special dean's advisory committee was particularly helpful in getting broad-based, varied input into both projects. This committee was made up of parents, teachers, state education department personnel, and professors. They were invaluable in the planning and implementation phases of the project.

Approximately 200 teachers from both urban and rural school systems in the two states have received Project HELP training. Participants included elementary, secondary, and special education teachers, administrators, and support personnel. Well over ninety-nine percent of these took the training for graduate credit. This practice ensures better teacher participation and quality control.

Delivery and Recommendations

The following variations of delivery systems have been used.

Calendar Time. Ten-week, eighteen-week, and thirty-six-week time frames have been used. The ten-week session was deemed too short to satisfactorily carry out the assignments within the classroom. The thirty-six-week time frame was deemed too long because teachers wanted to try their newly learned skills on more than one student, which is not permitted during the training period.

Inservice Contact Time. Staff-teacher contact time varied from eighteen to twenty-four to forty hours. Each time frame proved satisfactory as long as the hours were distributed adequately. The timing scheme that appeared to work best included an intensive introductory session (four to six hours on two successive days), at least three monthly follow-up sessions (three hours each) for brainstorming and support, and an intensive final session (four to six hours).

Format. Knowing that a straight lecture format is deadly, the format, which worked extremely well, combined lectures given by the project staff;

small group interactions of not more than ten teachers to one staff member for sharing joys, accomplishments, frustrations, and ideas; and hands-on experience with resource materials and methods that work with exceptional children. The key to learning these techniques was for each teacher to actively practice what he or she was learning in his or her own classroom with his or her own student.

It is strongly recommended that a teacher carry out the assignments on only one student during the inservice training. If the teacher tries during training to use these new procedures on all of the students who have learning problems, failure will surely result.

Staff. Training staff should be chosen on the basis of sound experience and their ability to communicate with others. The staff-to-teacher ratio should not exceed one to ten in the small group interactions that are essential to the training.

Credit-No Credit. When given the opportunity, ninety-nine percent of the teachers in the project chose to pay for and receive graduate credit for the training. It is believed that granting credit was an added incentive for participation.

Location. As long as the teachers worked with students in their own classrooms, it didn't seem to matter where the inservice meetings were held. However, sessions held in participants' schools were preferred to classes held elsewhere. Facilities should be comfortable and have space for large group meetings (cafeteria, auditorium, library) and small group meetings (individual classrooms).

Administrators, support personnel, and teachers should work together in learning these much needed skills. Ideally, an entire building staff could be trained together, which would likely lead to a well articulated and supported program suitable to meeting the needs of all exceptional children in a given school.

Resources

The following resources have proven useful over the past several years:

1. Local advisory committee made up of a broad spectrum of parents of exceptional children, teachers, and other professionals.

2. National Support Systems Project
   Special Deans' Grants Program Support
   350 Elliott Hall
   75 East River Road
   Minneapolis, MN 55455

3. Teacher Corps
   Exceptional Child Demonstration Program
   University of Miami
   P.O. Box 248074
   Miami, FL 33124

4. Plains Teacher Corps Network
Annex 12B
University of Nebraska at Omaha
60th and Dodge Streets
Omaha, NB 68182
Dr. Robert Mortensen, executive director

The Project HELP learning packet (Martin, L. L.; Garhart, C. K.; Hershey, M.; and Cox, L. M. HELP for Educating Exceptional Children in the Classroom, 1975, 250 pp.) is available from Dr. Larry Martin, School of Education, Auburn University at Montgomery, Montgomery, AL 36117.

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSERVICE MODELS

PENNSYLVANIA: PROJECT S.T.R.E.A.M.

Spencer Salend

Project S.T.R.E.A.M. is a federally funded, cooperative project between Lehigh University, the Easton Area School District, and the Colonial-Northampton Intermediate Unit (I.U. #20) in Pennsylvania to provide regular educators with inservice training about special education. This paper describes the planning process, governance, staffing, and program operations for Project S.T.R.E.A.M.--staff training of regular educators about mainstreaming--and offers recommendations for replication.

Planning Process

The initial plan for an inservice program will have a direct effect on the ultimate success of the program, and can set a precedent of communication and cooperation among program institutions (local education agencies and higher education institutions) that should prevail throughout the project.

For Project S.T.R.E.A.M., the planning process marked a joint effort by members of Lehigh University, Easton Area School District, and Colonial-Northampton I.U. #20 to define the inservice training needs of a target population and translate these findings into a comprehensive program. Needs were identified by using the Lehigh Assessment of Professional Inservice Needs survey instrument, which a sample of regular educators in the Easton Area School District completed. The needs assessment addressed such issues as content, professional status, rewards for participation, and time, place and length of training sessions.

Governance and Staffing

A multidisciplinary advisory council was formed to be responsible for project governance and planning. Council members include regular and special education teachers and administrators, representatives of higher education, and parents of handicapped children.

The project staff is made up of a coordinator, an assistant, and internal and external facilitators. The project coordinator wears many hats, such as teaching inservice courses, developing instructional modules, working directly with school personnel, presenting one-day workshops, supervising program evaluation, and disseminating project products.

The project assistant is a half-time position designed to aid the project coordinator, provide research assistance, and supervise the use of instructional materials during training sessions.

The project budget was designed to allow the staff to hire internal and external facilitators to aid in the delivery of services to target populations. External facilitators come from outside the local education agency and possess expertise in an area of need; internal facilitators also possess expertise

in a given area, but come from within the local education agency. Although the roles and expected outcomes of the facilitators vary, the majority of facilitators have aided the project by offering inservice course presentations.

Program Operations

Project S.T.R.E.A.M. is divided into three parts: an inservice course, resource staff assistance, and development of modules and instructional materials on the competencies regular education personnel need to successfully educate handicapped students in a least restrictive environment.

The inservice course is fifteen weeks, and earns three credits from Lehigh University. It is taught in one of the local school district buildings. Participants, who serve children attending the Colonial-Northampton I.U. schools, include regular and special education teachers, administrators, guidance counselors, and ancillary services personnel.

Course content includes: (1) examining the effect of mainstreaming on school personnel, the regular child, and the handicapped child; (2) designing strategies to orient regular classroom children to a handicapped child; (3) designing strategies to prepare a handicapped child to enter the mainstream; (4) specifying strategies for teaching handicapped children in the regular classroom; (5) setting up peer tutoring programs; (6) developing instructional materials for an exceptional learner; and (7) designing a classroom environment to accommodate a handicapped child. Content delivery is varied, with presentation styles including role-plays, simulations, learning games, lectures, and media presentations. Particular emphasis is on regular education personnel sharing their current mainstreaming experiences.

The second project component allows the S.T.R.E.A.M. staff trainers to provide direct technical assistance to local school district personnel involved in educating handicapped students in a least restrictive environment. An analysis of project staff logs revealed a wide variety of staff activities, such as planning assessments and curricula, suggesting and modeling specific teaching techniques, planning and implementing behavior change programs, and arranging the physical design of a regular classroom to meet the needs of a special student. This training component also allows project staff to work with administrators, parents, community agencies, and large groups of teachers (i.e., inservice days, faculty meetings).

A major goal of Project S.T.R.E.A.M. is to develop instructional modules for use in training regular education personnel who work with special students. These modules serve as the core curriculum for the inservice course, and are being developed for use by others. Brief descriptions of the modules follow. The term "learner" refers to teachers and others in the inservice program.

Module I: What is mainstreaming? This module introduces the learner to mainstreaming, Deno's cascade model, and the roles of educational personnel by creating a simulated mainstreamed class. Included in the module are ways to simulate handicaps, cued overhead transparencies, a matching test, and guidelines to adapt the simulated classroom for full participation by all learners.

Module II: What is the effect of mainstreaming on you? Module two gives the learner insight into the effects of mainstreaming on students, teachers, and parents. This module includes study questions related to a

bibliography of suggested readings on mainstreaming; a meeting of the minds role play on the effects of mainstreaming on students, teachers, and parents; and a videotape of several disabled persons discussing their school-related experiences.

Module III: How to orient nonhandicapped students to mainstreaming. This module is designed to help teachers assess the attitudes and actions of regular classroom students and implement a variety of strategies to orient these students to a mainstreamed child. This module includes assessment strategies to measure the acceptance of individual students by their peers, and books, records, and activities for orientation. A videotape of a teacher modeling several of the strategies with a class is shown.

Module IV: How to prepare handicapped students and special education personnel to enter the mainstream. This module is designed for school administrators and other school personnel involved in preparing a handicapped student for entry into the mainstream. Learners read articles on preparing students and teachers to enter the mainstream and view a prototype slide-tape presentation of a school district's attempt to orient students to the mainstream.

Module V: How to conduct a task analysis. This module prepares learners to analyze a task, material, or skill into sequential components to increase the probability of a student performing the task successfully. Included in this module are transparencies, materials, and readings related to task analysis and cueing techniques.

Module VI: How to design a classroom for mainstreaming purposes. In this module, learners explore the effects of teacher-directed instruction, open-classroom instruction, and isolated-seating instruction on student performances through simulating the three classroom designs. Included are simulation guidelines, discussion questions on the simulation activity, and strategies for adapting a classroom to exceptional learners.

Module VII: Adapting academic games for mainstreaming purposes. This module takes the learner through the steps of designing games for mainstreaming purposes by having the learner develop and construct an instructional game. General information on instructional games is introduced with the game "Hollywood Squares." After participating in this game, learners view a videotape of students at different academic levels participating in a similar "Hollywood Squares" game. An article about developing games for mainstreaming purposes is included.

Module VIII: Adapting physical education games for mainstreaming purposes. This module trains learners to adapt physical education games to allow participation by children with specific physical and mental disabilities. Included is a videotape of a physical education teacher adapting teaching techniques and modifying game rules to facilitate participation of all students in a physical education game. After viewing the videotape, groups of two or three learners choose a physical education game and describe modifications a teacher could make to include children with specific physical and mental disabilities.

Recommendations

Involve the trainees in the program. The extent to which trainees participate and benefit from a program is related to the extent to which they are actively engaged in developing and implementing the program. It is recommended that trainees be involved in the planning, governance, implementation, and evaluation of an inservice program.

Identify and enlist the L.E.A.'s power brokers. Many organizations have individuals who exert a tremendous influence over the opinions of others. It is recommended that these individuals, called power brokers, be identified within districts and schools and their support enlisted.

Make the trainee's classroom an integral part of inservice training. Many trainees perceive typical one-day inservice training as a failure because no follow-up supervision was provided. It is recommended that trainees be given an opportunity to use their classrooms for part of the learning experience. This requires project staff to work directly with teachers in their classrooms. Although this environment may not be as secure as the "isolated college classroom," its benefits can be many for the trainees, their classes, and the trainer.

Don't reinvent the wheel. The advent of Public Law 94-142 means a greater amount of information related to the inservice training of regular education personnel is appearing in the literature, such as the ERIC data bases. In planning any inservice program, rather than starting from scratch, examine, adapt, and use these existing materials in your program.

For those interested in replicating Project S.T.R.E.A.M., several instructional modules are being developed. These modules are written for the inservice trainer and include learning activities that a trainer can use in workshops.

More information is available from Spencer Salend, School of Education, Lehigh University, 524 Brodhead Ave., Bethlehem, PA 18015.

STATE EDUCATION INSERVICE MODELS

NEBRASKA: STATE EDUCATION TRAINING SERIES

Donna Aksamit

The Nebraska State Education Training Series (SETS) is an inservice training program that was modeled after Arizona's SELECT inservice program, and implemented in Nebraska during September 1976. The program's goal is to provide educators, parents, and other interested individuals with knowledge and skills necessary for developing and implementing programs that meet the needs of handicapped students. The majority of SETS content is designed for regular educators.

Governance and Funding

The State Education Training Series resulted from the collaborative efforts of several agencies. Funded by the Nebraska State Department of Education, Special Education Section, from a 91-230 Title VI-D training grant, the program was approved and initial curriculum developed by representatives from regular and special education departments of fourteen Nebraska colleges/universities. These fourteen institutions established a consortium of teacher trainers that, along with the Nebraska Department of Education, continues to be active in the development and teaching of SETS curriculum. Funds from the Title VI-D grant are used to employ an inservice development specialist, who is responsible for SETS administration and management.

Credit for SETS training is provided by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln through the Division of Adult and Continuing Education. The mechanisms to provide off-campus courses are already in place in this division, which provides additional support for SETS by making available space, facilities, and a secretary to work with the inservice development specialist. The Special Education Department, as well as Teachers College, contribute faculty time and facilities to the program. In addition to collaboration among the Nebraska State Department of Education, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (Teachers College, Department of Special Education, Division of Adult and Continuing Education), and the consortium of teacher trainers, the success of SETS depends on the cooperation of local education agencies, educational service units, and other requesting agencies. Each agency where SETS workshops are delivered is responsible for designating a contact person to assist in publicity and registration, and to arrange facilities and equipment.

Program Description and Operations

SETS is a competency-based training model. Curriculum is organized into training components that cover a variety of topics. Currently, fifty components address content areas such as learning disabilities, classroom management, communication skills, peer tutoring, grading and evaluation, and

informal measurement procedures. Components are organized into modules, with each module consisting of five components related in general content (e.g., five components about learning disabilities). Each component can be delivered independently and each has a separate course outline, which means that schools, agencies, and individual participants can select components to meet their specific needs.

SETS components are presented in either ten- or six-hour workshops for which various schedules are available. The majority of ten-hour workshops have been delivered on Fridays (6 to 9p.m.) and Saturdays (8a.m. to 4p.m.). Components offered for professional growth only (six hours) are delivered during a school day, with educators receiving release time. Instructors are paid an honorarium, and travel, meals, and lodging expenses are reimbursed.

Because SETS is delivered on request, fliers describing available content are sent to school administrators, educational service units, past participants, parents, and other agencies twice yearly. Requests are returned to the SETS administrator and secretary, and sites are selected on the basis of the availability of funds and instructors. Before each semester's offerings, another flier with component titles, competencies, delivery sites, and registration information is disseminated.

Selection and Training of Instructors. A number of teacher educators from the consortium are involved in developing components and teaching SETS workshops. However, the tremendous need for inservice training and the busy schedules of teacher educators create a need for innovative alternatives to the exclusive use of college/university faculty as inservice providers. As an alternative SETS uses practicing educators as instructors. Administrators, special education teachers, regular classroom teachers, counselors, and psychologists, among others are employed in addition to college/university faculty. Each potential instructor is interviewed by the inservice development specialist and vitae are kept on file.

Instructors' training sessions, which include the inservice development specialist and SETS secretary as well as representatives from the various collaborative agencies, are held at least twice yearly. All SETS training available for graduate credit is taught in part by instructors from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln graduate faculty so that university standards are maintained.

Curriculum Development and Documentation. Curriculum is developed by SETS instructors and consortium faculty in cooperation with the inservice development specialist. If more than one instructor teaches the same component, all involved instructors develop competencies and materials together. This procedure ensures that each participant taking a given component receives instruction on the same competencies. In addition, instructors who teach different, but related, components (e.g., the five learning disabilities components) coordinate their competencies and activities to avoid duplication.

Instructors develop a course outline for each ten- and six-hour component, which is on file for review. When training is delivered at the various schools and other agencies, each participant receives a copy of the outline, which includes: (1) component competency statements, (2) description of activities that will be completed to achieve competencies, (3) description of outside class projects to be completed by participants registered for graduate credit, and (4) description of procedures for grading participants.

Each component is packaged and on file at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Division of Adult and Continuing Education. Packets include: (1) a course outline, (2) copies of all consumable materials, and (3) a list of all nonconsumables (books, films, videotapes, etc.).

Professional Growth and Credit Options. SETS components can be taken free of charge for professional growth. Participants who achieve all competencies and attend the entire component(s) receive a letter at the end of the school year confirming their inservice activities. This letter is a record of their training and can be shared with administrators for professional growth point verification.

Participants may register for University of Nebraska-Lincoln undergraduate or graduate credit, and each participant is responsible for contacting his or her advisor to determine the application of credit to a specific degree program. If SETS is approved by the student's advisor, a maximum of nine hours may be applied to a degree program. Credit may be transferred to other consortium colleges.

To receive one, two, or three hours of credit, participants must take components two, four, and five, respectively, during one academic year. In addition to the in-class time required for one, two, and three hours of credit, participants taking SETS for graduate credit must successfully complete additional graduate-level assignments as determined by instructors and approved by the inservice development specialist, consortium members, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Graduate College. Participants taking SETS for credit also receive a confirmation letter at the end of each school year.

Instructors give each credit participant a letter grade when all assignments are completed and competencies are achieved. A separate grade is given for the graduate credit project. The in-class and project grades are averaged for a final grade assigned graduate students. Grades are submitted through regular University of Nebraska-Lincoln procedures and are included on student transcripts once yearly at the end of the Spring semester.

Evaluation. SETS is evaluated in several ways. Using a standardized evaluation form developed for SETS, participants evaluate the instructor and content of each component. Results are analyzed, summarized, shared with instructors, Teachers College, and the Graduate College, and kept on file. Modifications of the SETS program have resulted from participant evaluations. Participants are also asked to respond to follow-up questionnaires to determine the impact on teaching and students of the concepts and skills learned through SETS.

The inservice development specialist, Division of Adult and Continuing Education personnel, and State Department of Education staff monitor and evaluate the performance of instructors as they deliver training at various sites across the state.

The effectiveness of the SETS delivery model, as reflected by data on numbers of participants, competencies achieved, and skill implementation, is continually assessed and documented.

Strengths and Problems

The majority of components requested by schools and delivered through the SETS program are designed for elementary and secondary classroom

teachers. They are accountable for mildly to moderately handicapped youngsters who spend all or part of their school day in regular classrooms. One strength of the SETS model is its flexibility regarding the kinds of content that can be incorporated, so that it is not limited to teachers. Content designed for administrators, counselors, parents, resource teachers, and providers of programs for preschool handicapped children, among others, is also available on request.

A second strength of the program, as indicated by participant evaluations, is the credibility of SETS instructors. Criteria for selection are the individual's expertise in the curriculum area and his or her interpersonal and communication skills. The majority of SETS instructors who train regular classroom teachers are themselves classroom teachers or support personnel in public schools, and all instructors have been involved in programming for and/or teaching handicapped as well as nonhandicapped children.

The success of the SETS program is in large part due to the curriculum and the participants being actively involved in the learning process. Those components designed for classroom teachers and other regular educators, especially, provide extensive opportunity for interaction and experiences that will be beneficial in the classroom.

Schools and other agencies are encouraged to assess their needs and request training to meet those needs. Because they know about the fifty available components, faculties and staffs can identify and request the inservice training that they perceive will be most beneficial; training thus becomes a desired activity instead of something imposed from outside.

The fact that training is delivered at local education agencies and other agencies makes it more accessible and allows educators to learn in their working environment. This accessibility not only has a positive psychological effect but also allows educators, who might not travel to a college campus, to receive credit when credit components are offered. Additionally, schools and agencies can arrange for SETS training and provide a release day for professional growth components. This provision is especially responsive to teachers' concern that attending noncredit inservice programs on their "own" time is inappropriate. A considerable number of SETS components are also presented during "pre-school" teacher inservice days.

Finally, the extensive collaboration among the various agencies and institutions, and the options of credit or professional growth also contribute to the success of the program.

Perhaps the biggest weakness of the SETS model (and also one of its strengths) is that all instructors are employed and they cannot be on-call to provide on-site, follow-up, technical assistance. Lack of ongoing contact among inservice facilitators and participants is frequently a problem. While SETS instructors are not generally available for follow-up technical assistance, some help from instructors is available via phone conferences and written consultations.

Another problem pertains to follow-up evaluations. The final goal of any inservice program should be to determine teacher behavior change, implementation of skills, and impact on children. The State Education Training Series has attempted follow-up evaluations by sending surveys to all past participants, and has had limited success. Plans call for selecting one or two delivery sites for follow-up measurements.

Another problem involves the graduate credit option. To maintain university standards, all SETS graduate credit participants must have significant contact with graduate faculty members at the University of

Nebraska-Lincoln. This limits somewhat the amount of training that can be provided for graduate credit, as the number of graduate faculty with expertise in requested content areas is not always sufficient. One positive result of this requirement is that increased numbers of University of Nebraska-Lincoln Teachers College faculty and adjunct faculty are becoming aware of and involved with SETS. Such involvement enhances communications among college faculty, public and private educators, and parents.

For more information, contact Donna L. Aksamit, Department of Special Education, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 204 F. Barkely Center, Lincoln, NB 68583.

STATE EDUCATION INSERVICE MODELS

NEW JERSEY: MAINSTREAM INSERVICE PROJECT

Myrna Merron, William K. Friedel, and Barbara Nadler

The New Jersey Mainstream Inservice Project is a response to the personnel development mandate of Public Law 94-142. The project's primary goal is to link appropriate resources to personnel needs arising from attempts to create a least restrictive environment for handicapped children. The Bureau of the Education for the Handicapped (BEH), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, awarded funds to the New Jersey Department of Education to support a cooperative venture between the state department, fifty local school districts, and five institutions of higher education.

This project is predicated on three hypotheses:

1. Collaboration among and within different educational institutions is fundamental to effective staff development and widespread change.

2. Thoughtful, continuous planning in an environment of sustained support is essential to the evolution of effective staff development.

3. Emphasis on institutionalizing the change process within the system, rather than investment and control by one individual, is vital to the growth and development of the educational system.

Project Description

In the spring of 1977, the New Jersey Department of Education solicited proposals for staff development programs about the mainstreaming process. Of 611 school districts in the state, 115 submitted proposals, and fifty were invited to participate in the three-year project.

Grants were awarded on the basis of quality, geographic location, and/or size. A representative sampling of the state was sought so that efforts could be examined in the context of demographic variability. The kinds of inservice activities planned and the target groups varied from district to district. Each selected district was required to designate an inservice coordinator to be responsible for implementing the grant proposal. The coordinator's primary function is in some other role--learning disability consultant, resource room teacher, etc. Inservice coordinators spend ten days per year in regional and/or statewide seminars and workshops designed to assist them in planning, implementing, and evaluating their inservice efforts. Regional groups of ten meet in monthly seminars with a college or university consultant. Statewide meetings are scheduled in September and June.

Each college faculty member participates for a minimum of fifty days per year. The primary responsibility of participating college faculty is to provide consultation on the processes of planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating the inservice training. In addition to monthly seminars,

college consultants are available for on-site visits in the districts and participate in monthly planning sessions with state staff. To aid the college consultants in meeting functions not normally associated with their traditional on-campus role, ten days of professional development activity are provided.

For the services of a faculty member, adjunct fees for three credits of release time each semester are paid by the State Department of Education to the appropriate college or university. Expenses and a stipend are paid to each college consultant for time devoted to the project that exceeds the responsibility of two three-credit courses.

The project director is a full-time staff member of the State Department of Education and assignment to this project represents only a portion of his work at the department. His responsibilities include overall administration and coordination of project activities. A full-time university intern acts as administrative assistant to the director. A university faculty member is employed part time by the state department to coordinate professional development activity for participating college faculty. For year three, another university faculty member has been employed part time to assist in the overall coordination of the project.

Problems

The complexity of the undertaking, the lack of a model to follow, the discovery of new information, and the fragmented, part-time involvement of all participants have produced many problems.

Operationalizing the principle of collaboration has evoked provocative arguments and dissension. The term itself has a multiplicity of meanings for participants, a situation that has led to authority issues, covert power struggles and, at times, lack of cohesiveness of purpose.

Most deeply enmeshed in this dilemma has been the project director. Although conceptually committed to collaboration, he is solely responsible to BEH for project implementation. This fiscal responsibility often interferes with collaboration.

The limitations of personal contact time has resulted in dissemination of a great deal of written material--a virtual paper blitz. Although the project staff acknowledges the existence of a saturation level, the need to maintain ongoing communication has been foremost.

Planning and problem solving have frustrated many participants because neither has seemed pertinent to immediate problems. The proclivity to identify "the" expert or "the" package is or was in direct opposition to the focus on reflection. To aid districts in this planning and implementation process, the state advocated the Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM) (Yavorsky, Diane. Discrepancy Evaluation: A Practitioner's Guide. Charlottesville: University of Virginia, Evaluation Research Center, 1976) as the standard format for continuation grant applications. Resistance to the use of the DEM arose from the ranks of both inservice coordinators and college consultants. People used the stated collaborative stance almost as a weapon against any state mandated format.

There is probably general agreement that initially local school coordinators believed they were going to be recipients of definitive answers to inservice on mainstreaming. Instead, they were asked to be originators of solutions--problem solvers. Tension and anger arose when what was expected

was not delivered. The realizations have evolved that there are no real solutions to inservice education's problems, and that a single inservice model cannot be applied universally.

Successes

Attainment of objectives is reflected in descriptive data. The focus of evaluation is on change and patterns of change in three dimensions: training, interaction, and implementation.

As a result of training, the planning skills of inservice coordinators, as demonstrated in grant proposals, have improved significantly. A rating of first and third year proposals indicates that coordinators have gained in their ability to describe personnel development needs, objectives, resources, activities, and evaluation procedures. There is an expressed belief that, however distasteful and time consuming, the DEM facilitates a long-range planning process.

The seminar group format is highly regarded both for receiving didactic training, and as a support network. Seminars provide a consistent, nonthreatening atmosphere for sharing ideas, discussing problems, and considering solutions. In addition, the seminars have provided linkages for interdistrict inservice efforts. Several districts have engaged in joint projects and participating colleges are attempting to provide graduate or inservice credits for some approved, monitored activities.

Interaction with the consultants has led inservice coordinators to view these higher education faculty as knowledgeable, helpful resources. Consultants' helpful stance in seminars is considered supportive of individual efforts and reinforces the concept of collaboration. District visits by consultants are judged beneficial.

The state education agency is a valuable source of information. Participants think that their increased awareness of available resources and knowledge of good inservice practices is directly attributable to data flow from project staff. Moreover, information apparently takes on added significance in the district if it emanates from the state department.

Overall, grant proposals have been implemented, with some districts making alterations and others exceeding projections. Many districts used the Mainstream Inservice Project as a model, forming inservice planning committees similar in function to the seminar groups. In addition, greater emphasis is being given to use of internal district resources, an approach favored by the project.

Statewide meetings have been well received. In particular, groups consisting of staff, consultants, and district representatives, which were formed to plan meetings, have resulted in a heightened awareness of the value of participatory planning and the accompanying sense of ownership.

Recommendations

Several areas are recognized as requiring improvement in procedures and/or clarification:

1. The nature of collaboration must be delineated, and explication of responsibility as related to role is critical to project functioning. An informal job description and a set of procedures are being formulated.

2. Emphasis on linkage requires refinement of the communication system and increased accessibility of people.

3. Training of all participants must accentuate knowledge of how people and institutions engage in change.

4. The state education agency must devote more effort to institutionalizing the roles of college consultant and district inservice coordinator. Formal acknowledgment of these roles should solve the problem of inadequate time now available to those people.

5. Careful consideration of readiness, appropriateness, and urgency must precede selection of materials for dissemination to ensure maximum use of relevant data.

6. Evaluation procedures require streamlining. Questions posed must be realistic and relate to the project's stage of development. Procedures for prompt feedback to participants need to be established.

7. Field based and theoretical research should be fostered to encourage validation of efforts.

8. Some college consultants and inservice coordinators appear to be more effective than others. Characteristics that seem related to success should be validated and incorporated into criteria for future recruitment.

Summary

Existing data tend to support the basic hypotheses of the project. People in local education agencies, people in institutions of higher education, and people in the State Department of Education call each other by their first names and share the frustrations of building a collaborative, working inservice model. Participants have increased planning and proposal writing skills and are more aware of inservice education as an ongoing process. There is optimism that what is being built is a foundation from which sensible, logical, and effective comprehensive personnel development can evolve.

For more information, contact Dr. Myrna Merron, Assistant Professor, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ 07079; William K. Friedel, Office of Staff Development, Bureau of Pupil Personnel Services, N.J. Department of Education, Trenton, NJ 08625; or Dr. Barbara Nadler, Lecturer, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, NJ 08903.

INSERVICE MODELS FOR SPECIFIC AREAS

MICHIGAN: MAINSTREAMING PRESCHOOLERS

Sara Jane L. Adler

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation in Ypsilanti, Michigan, began its involvement in curriculum development for preschool-aged handicapped and nonhandicapped children in 1962 with the Ypsilanti Perry Preschool Project, one of the nation's first compensatory early childhood intervention projects. From those early attempts at programming for preschoolers, High/Scope's curriculum model has matured through years of research, development, and replication. Under the leadership of High/Scope's founder and President, David P. Weikart, the curriculum has been replicated throughout the United States, Australia, and in several Latin American countries. The Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum has been validated as a program model by the U.S. Office of Education and National Institute of Education Joint Dissemination and Review Panel.

At High/Scope, we believe that our program replications have been a success primarily because we have focused on developing a workable inservice training model. We believe that teachers benefit from continued training and support throughout their teaching careers, and that inservice development programs must be designed to meet teachers' needs--to be more effective in the classroom, to work well with parents, and to interact with other professionals and the community for mutual benefit. But effective inservice programs do not happen by themselves; they result from careful planning and ongoing evaluation.

Three steps were involved in developing High/Scope's successful teacher training program: (1) developing a curriculum for children, (2) designing training materials for teachers, and (3) developing methods to insure long-term training and dissemination. At each stage of the process, careful documentation, evaluation, and planning led to the training model now in use.

Curriculum

The Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum, a result of seventeen years of research and development, is based on a consistent philosophical/theoretical perspective. We found that it is important to have a well-defined philosophy to guide curriculum development, and a clear idea of how that philosophy would apply to actual classroom practice before we could begin to train teachers. We also found that in classrooms that mainstream handicapped children, teachers are more likely to have a high quality program for all children if the curriculum and method for the handicapped and nonhandicapped are similar in philosophy and compatible in practice.

Teacher Training Materials

The teacher training materials developed at High/Scope are a direct outgrowth of the curriculum for children. Each of the curriculum areas, or

key experiences, has a corresponding teacher training component. Additional training modules have been developed on equipping and arranging a classroom, establishing a daily routine, team teaching and planning, and working with parents.

Early training materials were developed in response to observers' questions. The teachers in High/Scope's demonstration classrooms began to write down the most commonly asked questions and their responses. The first training materials shared only our experiences and offered specific activity guides, but with experience, training materials became more general and more adaptable to other settings and to varied populations. This was a direct response to teachers' needs.

Current training materials include a manual for teachers (Young Children in Action) and a variety of multimedia modules. The learning modules for teachers were produced for Head Start training and later under a special project grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Revised print materials to accompany the films, filmstrips and videotapes, and a handbook for teacher trainers are scheduled for publication in 1980. Each of these is designed with the teacher in mind: the format is straightforward, topics are easily located by an index and by use of major headings, and language is direct and free from theoretical jargon.

Training and Dissemination Methods

In High/Scope's early years of teacher training, we relied upon workshops, conference presentations, and operation of a demonstration classroom. These "awareness level" activities are great morale boosters for participants and are effective in disseminating information, but often they do not lead to significant and sustained attitudinal and behavioral change. The current model combines these activities with other strategies designed to sustain enthusiasm and changes over time.

A first consideration is team planning and evaluation. We ask teachers to evaluate classroom activities on a daily basis and to base each day's plan on the previous day's evaluation. This not only improves the quality of the program for children, but also provides a mechanism for team members to discuss their teaching strategies and their ability to interact as a team.

Another key element is the inservice workshop sequence. Workshops are presented on a regular basis and are planned around the teachers' needs. Each workshop presents ideas, principles, or guidelines with examples; teachers are asked to develop strategies and activities that are both consistent with the curriculum framework and relevant to the specific, unique needs of the children in the teacher's class. The workshops must present a consistent philosophy, be interrelated rather than segmented, and be presented regularly to be effective. Training that is too specific or too general in content and applicability will seldom be implemented in a teacher's classroom. Part of the inservice workshop requires a teacher to apply the ideas and principles to his or her unique situation. Each teacher should leave a workshop with a specific plan for action.

One of the most important aspects of the model is selecting and training an on-site curriculum assistant or supervisor. This person should be an experienced classroom teacher and must be committed to the same curriculum

model as the teachers. The curriculum assistant is trained by a High/Scope consultant both during teacher trainer institutes in Ypsilanti and during on-site consultations. On-site training consists of planning, presenting, and evaluating workshops with the consultant, observing the consultant giving feedback to the teachers after an observation, and conferences and discussions with the consultant. The curriculum assistant seems to be a key link to long-term training success.

Another key element in successful training has been an emphasis on mutual problem solving among the classroom staff, the curriculum assistant, and the High/Scope consultant, rather than the consultant's acting as the "expert." Observation and evaluation instruments thus become guidelines for discussing a teacher's strengths and defining areas that need improvement, rather than a threatening assessment of weaknesses. Curriculum implementation checklists and the preschool teacher training profile (a more comprehensive instrument) are reviewed periodically by the trainer and teacher. Classroom observation by the supervisor with follow-up discussions become a regular routine and a necessary part of the inservice program.

A final consideration in developing an inservice program is the necessity of a team approach. We found that all team members--teacher, aides, administrators, and special education personnel--must receive training together if they are to function as a team. Joint training helps prevent teachers and aides from leaving a workshop with conflicting plans for the same child. Training as a team not only facilitates consistency in programming, but also helps each member of the team to appreciate the talents and expertise that the other team members bring to the children.

Specific Training Issues in Mainstreaming

At High/Scope, we developed specific methods for teachers to incorporate therapeutic activities within their regular classroom routines. We found ways for special education staff to work alongside the regular teacher in the classroom rather than in an isolated therapeutic setting. We served as translators, helping to de-mystify the jargon of special education. We helped regular education teachers find new confidence as they used the child development knowledge they already had and applied their skills in new ways.

Most importantly though, as we worked with teams of regular and special educators, we found that they began to communicate with each other more effectively. There was less duplication of services and more cooperation. Each team member came to understand and respect the expertise and talents that others brought to the mainstreamed classroom. They began to pool their knowledge and skills for the benefit of all of the children in the class--handicapped and nonhandicapped.

These outcomes justify High/Scope's ongoing, inservice staff development program on mainstreaming preschoolers. The focus is on the team and on inservice training, rather than on "just workshops" and "just teachers." A well-planned inservice program could be the key to successful mainstreaming.

For more information, contact Sara Jane L. Adler, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 600 N. River St., Ypsilanti, MI 48197; phone (313) 485-2000.

INSERVICE MODELS FOR SPECIFIC AREAS

MISSOURI: ADAPTING PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Leon E. Johnson

As stated in Public Law 94-142, special education must provide for all handicapped children, and physical education is an integral part of that special education. Before 1975-76, the Department of Health and Physical Education, University of Missouri-Columbia, was responsible for attempting to meet the inservice educational needs of Missouri teachers through workshops, institutes, and continuing professional education. However, evidence showed that the department had not provided the necessary leadership or appropriate topic offerings to meet teachers' needs. Therefore, in 1975, a statewide inservice training program was established in conjunction with the Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Department of Health and Physical Education and Division of Continuing Professional Education at the University.

Division of Responsibility

Although this inservice program is under the direction of the Department of Health and Physical Education, it should be noted that there has been total cooperation with all agencies on planning, financial responsibility, and evaluation. For example, the State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education was responsible for selecting the geographic sites where the first inservice program in adapted physical education would be conducted. Selected were the regions farthest from the university, because data suggested that those teachers who were not reasonably close to the university had the least amount of knowledge about teaching handicapped children and the least positive attitude toward handicapped people in general. The Department of Health and Physical Education was responsible for providing qualified physical educators to teach the appropriate curriculum on adapted physical education. The Division of Continuing Professional Education was responsible for advertising, securing appropriate teaching sites, obtaining necessary approval from local educational agencies for teachers to participate in an inservice program, and handling the arrangements for credit and final grade reporting.

Objectives and Descriptions

The primary objective of the original 1975-76 inservice training program was to provide 125 regular and special educators with a three semester-credit-hour course in "adapted physical education." The goal of this course was to expand the participants' understanding of the educational needs and motoric development of handicapped children, so that these children could be included in a regular physical activity setting whenever possible. Many special education teachers in Missouri, especially at the elementary level, have the

responsibility for the motoric development of handicapped children. Therefore, they were included in the original population to participate in the inservice education program.

The enrollment in each course in adapted physical education was limited to twenty-five teachers. This limit was imposed primarily to insure that all teachers participating in the course would be provided practical, hands-on teaching opportunities. In many cases, this experience was with handicapped children from a teacher's class. This approach has proven to be most valuable because, with few exceptions, the children who were brought to these sessions had the most severe individual motoric handicaps. In turn, this allowed the teachers to focus on the individual problem of each handicapped student.

During the 1975-76 inservice training program, two off-campus workshops were conducted at selected sites. In critical evaluations, the teachers in the field determined that the workshops were not sufficient, so no more workshops were scheduled. Following that decision, the adapted physical education course was selected for use in meeting the educational needs of Missouri teachers.

In the original planning for this inservice course, it was decided that the most efficient way to deliver the inservice program was for the instructors to go to the local units rather than to bring the teachers to the university. Transportation for delivering these services was coordinated with the University of Missouri-Columbia aircraft service. Because of the central location of the university, it was possible to reach the four corners of the state in approximately one hour of flying time. This enabled the instructors to fly out once a week, teach the three-hour session, and return. If auto travel had been required, it would have been impossible to accommodate some of the geographic areas of the state. It should be noted that all the instructors received extra compensation for teaching in the program.

Keplication and Problems

Such a model for providing inservice education to regular educators probably can be reproduced in all states. The cooperative efforts of the State Department of Education and the local educational administrators is the key to the success of such services. There are numerous ways in which the financial responsibilities can be handled to accommodate the expense of such a program. Several of the local education agencies are now providing the participants' share (one-third of the expenses) through their share of Public Law 94-142 monies.

The problems encountered during the four years of the operation of this inservice model have not been numerous. Possibly the greatest difficulty was publicizing the course offering to teachers in local schools. Traditionally, the Division of Continuing Professional Education has worked directly with the superintendent or principal of a local education agency to promote the program. However, often information about the course did not reach the teachers in time for them to arrange to participate in the sessions, which took place one night a week for thirteen weeks. To cope more successfully with this communication problem, we have established "key" teachers in each geographic area. These key teachers then relay information to their colleagues when a course is scheduled to be taught in their area. This has

worked well, and we are continuing to use this method during the remainder of this program. Each local teacher who assists the Division of Continuing Professional Education in getting twenty-five teachers enrolled in each course is rewarded for the effort.

The most useful resources for this inservice program have been the competent instructors who have provided the expertise in adapted physical education. The valuable instructional media that are available have also been an important aid to the instruction. The participants are eager to see audiovisual material, receive handout information, and participate in the practicum. These allow them to provide concrete "answers" to their students' problems when they return to their respective teaching assignments. This course has been designed to do just that, and is possibly the most meaningful part of the inservice effort. The courses are team taught, and provide contact with specific cognitive areas such as physical fitness, perceptual motor development, and evaluation techniques that are presented with the total child development concept approach.

Since this adapted physical education inservice program began four years ago, some 750 regular and special educators have participated. Possibly, that number is not significant considering how many handicapped children are in need of motoric development. However, available data indicate that physical education services for the handicapped have improved dramatically in the areas where the course has been offered. There is evidence that some limited inservice training is being offered by local education agencies, using participants who have taken the adapted physical education courses. The first year this program was conducted, 125 teachers participated. During 1979-80, 350 teachers will be offered the course. In addition, the inservice program has been expanded to include teachers of the severely handicapped.

In the future it would be advantageous to include some mini-courses in various areas (testing/measuring, perceptual motor development, specific areas of handicapping conditions, etc.) for those who have already participated. Numerous teachers have expressed a desire to have such course offerings made available in a similar manner. It is obvious, too, that administrators should be involved in similar inservice education programs to make them aware of the kinds of problems teachers face daily in attempting to teach physical education to handicapped children.

For more information, contact Dr. Leon E. Johnson, Director, Teacher Training Program for the Handicapped, College of Education, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65201.

INSERVICE MODELS FOR SPECIFIC AREAS

OREGON: TRAINING RURAL ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL

Carol A. Sivage and Cheryl Scanlon

Over half of America's schools are in rural areas, where special education resources are usually difficult to obtain because of isolation. Technical assistance on diagnosis and prescription, information on due process, procedures, and other assistance from special educators can be miles and hours away.

Direction and leadership for the mandate of Public Law 94-142 is initiated at the State Department of Education, filtered through county education service districts, and finally reaches local school districts and schools. Reliance is on the community and the community school to implement the mandate and provide services to rural handicapped children. The school principal, as instructional leader and potential change agent, is a vital participant in this process. School counselors and support personnel also are essential in delivering services to handicapped children.

The inservice training workshop described is intended to give rural administrators and support personnel the knowledge, skills, and demonstrated ability to comply with federal laws. Further, the workshop offers the opportunity for ongoing communication with urban resource personnel, State Department of Education, education service district personnel, and local colleagues. This sharing provides a valuable addition to training for often isolated, rural educators.

Funding and Governance

Funding for the training activities was provided through Special Projects Grants from the Oregon State Department of Education, Special Education Division. A Portland State University, Special Education Department faculty member obtained the grant and directed the activities. Program operation and governance was facilitated through Portland State University, with cooperative training activities coordinated through and located in the local rural Linn-Benton Education Service District.

Program Description

The specific target population was determined in conjunction with recommendations from the Oregon Cooperative Personnel Planning Council and the State Department of Education. Participants invited to the inservice

---

Special thanks to Dr. Robert Wininger, associate superintendent, Redmond Public Schools, Redmond, Ore.; and to Gary Covey, Linn-Benton Education Service District, Albany, Ore.

activities totaled forty administrators and local building support personnel. The workshop consisted of approximately twenty-eight group contact hours, which included three-and-one-half-hour sessions for eight half-days, from October through June.

All sessions were held on Friday mornings, a time that seemed best for participants. The first half of the activities were informational, with the second half devoted to discussion, practicum activities, and individual consultations with workshop planners. In addition to class sessions, staff-directed site visitations were made to participants' schools.

Incentives of nine quarter-credit hours for participants were arranged through Portland State University. Graduate courses offered were as follows: ED 462, Education for the Exceptional Child (3 hours quarter-credits); and ED 509, Practicum: Administrative Leadership Serving the Handicapped (6 hours quarter-credits).

General Program Goals

1. Rural administrators and building support personnel will increase knowledge and understanding of handicapped students and their educational needs by using pre- and post-test assessments.
2. Rural administrators and support personnel will receive twenty-eight hours of training in administration and implementation of Public Law 94-142.
3. Rural administrators and support personnel will complete an individual notebook of procedures and guidelines to fit specific needs of district or school in their preparation of the monitoring process for Public Law 94-142.

Evaluation of Workshop

Formative and summative evaluation procedures were employed to measure direction for change in the inservice training. Cognitive and attitudinal gains were obtained for all participants. Listed are the specific areas evaluated:

1. Pre-post assessment of knowledge gains made on the handicapped.
2. Pre-post assessment on attitude on the handicapped using Rucker-Gable Scale.
3. Evaluation of action plan notebook based on the Oregon State Compliance Team Evaluation Checklist of Public Law 94-142.
4. Ongoing assessment directed from participant in identifying individual needs.
5. Several participants were selected by the State Department of Education for the evaluation of Public Law 94-142 compliance.

It is recommended that coordinated efforts be made by the State Department of Education to develop and implement a follow-up evaluation.

Essential Features and Suggestions for Replication

This inservice training model had a number of features that were thought to be important and essential for success. They are listed below as suggestions for those interested in replication.

1. A Focus on Information that is Practical, Individualized and Responsive to School Needs.

The workshop presented an opportunity to gain information, build new skills, and develop positive attitudes toward the handicapped. It allowed administrators the opportunity to formulate a practical action plan notebook that combined the mandated regulations of Public Law 94-142 and Oregon Administrative Rules for the Handicapped with local resources and situations.

2. Governance by a Consortium of University and Local Area Special Educators and General Educators.

The inservice training model was planned to reinforce long-lasting communication links between general administrators, local education service district, and school district special education staffs. A consortium arrangement with Portland State University was seen as important because of the availability of specialized resource consultants and also to provide the option of university credit toward certification and advanced degrees.

3. Aimed at Rural Administrators and Local Support Personnel.

The rationale for training rural administrators and support personnel is clear. They have far more responsibility for implementing Public Law 94-142 in their schools than do urban administrators, who can often rely on nearby school district special education personnel and use readily available services. Rural schools depend on community support and local resources to serve handicapped children. It is the rural principal and support personnel who must provide and coordinate services for handicapped students and comply with federal laws.

4. Planned to Strengthen Existing Communication Links

This inservice training model was planned to reinforce long-lasting communication links between general educators, local education service district and school district special education staffs, State Department of Education and state institutions of higher education. When this workshop was over, local resources were planned to provide follow-up and ongoing consultation to rural educators.

5. On-Site Offerings and Flexible Scheduling Options

The workshop was offered at a central location in the county participating in the consortium. On-site offerings that relied on local resource consultants as much as possible were helpful. The inservice training workshop was offered through half-day Friday morning sessions on a monthly basis throughout the school year, but another schedule seemed

promising for future workshops. It consists of a core of three full-day sessions held during late summer, followed by three one-half-day sessions spaced throughout the year. Both scheduling options provide for indepth, year-long contact at a time and place that was responsive to local participants' needs and schedules.

A Final Note

Because of the many agencies and groups involved, a successful workshop of this kind depends on careful planning and good communication. Building in time for planning meetings and making sure every participant is informed of all decisions are probably the most important factors for replication.

For more information, contact Dr. Carol A. Sivage, 4128 SW Condor, Portland, OR 97201; or Cheryl Scanlon, Special Education Department, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207.

INSERVICE MODELS FOR SPECIFIC AREAS

NORTH CAROLINA: INITIAL SCREENING OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Nissim Shimoni

This paper describes the development and implementation of an inservice training program designed to assist regular classroom teachers with two competency areas: identifying children who may have special needs, and optimizing the delivery of services to those who have been identified. Attitudes toward handicapped people were treated within the context of training for these two competencies.

The selection of these two competency areas was made on the basis of needs assessment results, and on the notion that any improvement in teachers' abilities to identify and serve handicapped children is sound and desirable. It was hoped that such training in identification might speed up intervention procedures to be applied by the regular classroom teacher, who may feel that he or she must await evaluation by a specialist.

The program was administered by the Triad Teacher Corps Consortium composed of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, and the High Point Public Schools. All Teacher Corps programs seek to develop, install, and institutionalize educational programs and practices that result in educational improvements for children in low-income areas. The Triad Teacher Corps project has selected as one of its components the area of exceptional children. The project began its two-year cycle of operation in 1976 focusing on one target school, elementary K-6 in High Point, N.C. Recently, the project has been funded for a five-year cycle that began in 1979-80.

Assessment of Needs

Formal and informal assessments of regular classroom teachers' needs were conducted by the Triad Teacher Corps staff on a continuous basis during the first year of the Teacher Corps' operation. Analysis of these assessments at the end of the year revealed needs in the areas of identifying and servicing exceptional children in the regular class. Identification services were provided through local school psychologists, and remedial services through a school resource program as well as through Teacher Corps. But the teachers indicated that the psychological services were at times slow to arrive because of heavy demands for them, and the remedial programs were limited to a short period during the day, for only those children who by formal assessment were found to be eligible. Many children with less acute special needs were left to be serviced solely by the regular classroom teacher.

The regular classroom teachers indicated their desire for assistance in developing skills that would enable them to identify the exceptional children, their special needs, and daily activities to meet their needs. Teachers' responses gave the impression that they were aware of the importance of

mainstreaming and committed to it. However, they wanted and needed assistance in developing competencies to implement it with their students until more formal evaluation and services could be provided through the specialists.

Program Description

As a faculty member in the School of Education at UNC-Greensboro with background training and experience in school psychology, I was assigned to spend one-fourth of my time to coordinate the exceptional child component of the Triad Teacher Corps program. After the needs assessment was completed and the results analyzed, a plan for an on-site inservice training program was developed and agreed upon by the Teacher Corps personnel and the principal of the target school. A program outline was presented to teachers in their weekly faculty meeting, along with an invitation for voluntary participation, as follows:

1. The Teacher Corps program will provide the necessary training and experiences, through the use of local and outside resources, to promote teachers' ability to serve exceptional children in the regular classroom.
2. During the training, the participants will increase their familiarity with the important provisions of Public Law 94-142 and the implications for regular classroom teachers.
3. After learning how to administer a standardized achievement test, a test of visual-motor coordination, and a test of mental ability, the participants will evaluate all the children in their classes to screen those with potential learning deficiency in any one, or more, academic area such as reading, spelling, math, visual-motor coordination, and mental ability.
4. Participants will learn to interpret the results of such tests, and use the scores to develop a test profile for every child to determine area(s) of educational needs.
5. Participants will be able to use the child's performance on norm-referenced tests, such as the Wide Range Achievement Test, to generate educational plans for the child in each of the academic areas tested.
6. Participants will be exposed to training programs in remedial strategies in academic areas such as language arts, math, and visual-motor coordination.

About one-fourth of the faculty volunteered to participate in the program. They included three regular classroom teachers, one resource room teacher, one intern and twenty student teachers. The latter group was not a part of the faculty and participated only in the remedial strategies phase of the program.

Implementation

Program implementation followed a schedule that was largely determined by the participants' readiness to move ahead in the program, but with an implicit commitment on their part to complete the program by the end of the school year. A logical sequence of activities was predetermined, as follows:

Phase I. September 1978

1. Orientation describing the rationale and the objectives of the program.
2. Review of the provisions of Public Law 94-142, The Education For All Handicapped Children Act, and their implications for regular classroom teachers working with handicapped children.
3. The purposes and tools of educational evaluation. What do standardized tests tell, or what they cannot tell, about a child's educational needs. How to use results of standardized tests to individualize instruction.

Phase II. October 1978

4. How to administer a standardized test. The importance of adhering to standardized procedures.
5. How to administer the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) and interpret its results. The WRAT is a diagnostic tool used to measure reading, spelling, and math skills and instructional levels.
6. How to administer the Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration (VMI), and interpret its results. This test measures the degree to which visual perception and motor behavior are integrated.
7. When is it necessary to administer a screening test of mental ability? How to administer the Slosson Intelligence Test (SIT) and interpret its results.

Phase III. October-November 1978

8. Each participant tested all children in his or her class using the tests described above, with the exception of the SIT, which was used only when considerable deficit in mental ability was suspected (usually when all test scores were considerably below present grade level) and only after obtaining parents' permission allowing the teacher to administer the test to their child. The test was used with approximately fifteen percent of the total group tested.

Phase IV. November 1978

9. How to compose a test profile using the results of the battery of tests mentioned above.

10. Developing guidelines to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses in a child on the basis of his or her test profile.
11. Developing criteria to be used in determining whether a child, who was screened by the teacher, needs comprehensive evaluation by a specialist.

Phase V.

12. Exposure to remedial techniques in language arts, math, and visual-motor coordination. Two consultants, one from the State Department of Public Instruction, and one from a nearby college, each conducted a two-day workshop in their respective area of specialty, implementing the remedial programs.

Phase VI. May 1979

13. Evaluation of the program.

Throughout the school year, I made myself available whenever trainees needed assistance or were ready to move to the next step in the program. One trainee, who volunteered to serve as a liaison between the trainees and the trainer, monitored the needs of the trainees and communicated these needs to me. She also scheduled meetings and contacted the principal to arrange teachers' release time.

The program was continuously monitored, which was necessary to make certain that each step in the process, especially those requiring the trainees to administer and interpret standardized tests, was carried out properly.

Trainees were encouraged to interpret the standardized tests results in two ways: norm-referenced results to compare a child's performance with peers or to determine instructional level in various areas; criterion-referenced results to determine mastery of prerequisite skills for correctly solving an item.

To ensure that learning in the two workshops on remedial strategies would be relevant to teachers' needs, special effort was made to call the consultants' attention to the specific results of the evaluation of the teachers before the workshops. Teachers brought to these workshops a summary of the evaluations done in their classrooms. The first part of the workshop was devoted to discussing with the consultants the results of their evaluations. This procedure made it unlikely that the consultants would overlook the results of an evaluation when discussing remedial strategies with the trainees. It is believed that this procedure made the content of the workshops more relevant to teachers' needs.

Evaluation, Benefits, Weaknesses, Recommendations

The last meeting of the year was devoted to evaluating the effectiveness of the program in meeting trainees' needs in servicing exceptional children. In an atmosphere of an open discussion, the questions of benefits, shortcomings, and recommendations were examined.

Following are the summaries of the participants' comments about benefits:

1. The training has increased awareness of the challenges and the difficulties involved in serving handicapped children in general, and in the regular classroom in particular.
2. The training has increased awareness of the potential contributions that regular classroom teachers can make in identifying children with special needs and in implementing remedial programs for them.
3. Those who completed the training can become resources to other teachers in their school in working with handicapped children.
4. Significant benefit was reported by one participant who is a member of the School Based Placement Committee.
5. The training has been helpful in determining which child is most likely to need a referral for formal comprehensive psychological evaluation by a specialist. The reasons for making such a referral became more clear than they were before the training.
6. All those who were referred to a specialist for formal evaluation, were found to be eligible for special services provided by programs for children with special needs.
7. The math and reading workshops helped in calling attention to "typical errors" that can be expected from children who are beginning to master new skills in these two areas, and the possible underlying reasons for these errors. The remedial strategies introduced during the workshops were helpful in working not only with children having problems in reading and math, but with all children.
8. The training has been helpful in improving the writing of individualized education plans.
9. That the training was conducted on site made it possible and easy to participate in it.

The difficulties and weaknesses of the program are summarized as follows:

1. More teachers could have participated in the program.
2. It was difficult and often time consuming to get parents' permission for screening their child with the Slosson Intelligence Test.
3. Not enough exposure to remedial strategies in the area of visual-motor coordination.
4. Since the program was administered by the Triad Teacher Corps which paid all expenses, it is not clear whether the public school will take over the responsibility of conducting similar training programs in the future. Thus, the decision regarding the degree to which the program will be institutionalized by the system lies now within the systems.

Finally, the participants' recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. It is recommended that the training phases of the program start and be completed before the beginning of the school year to minimize disturbances in the regular program.

2. Allow enough time for regular classroom teachers to administer the tests as early as possible in the school year and provide aides or substitutes to replace the teachers whenever necessary. Screening should be done as early as possible so that remedial programs can be installed.
3. Teachers' workdays can be used for bringing in consultants to work with teachers on remedial strategies.
4. Learn to use all sorts of tests.
5. More exposure to remedial strategies in visual-motor development.
6. Exposure to remedial strategies for behavioral problems.

Conclusion

In evaluating the program, it was thought that the program accomplished what it was set up to accomplish. Trainees' reactions and the reaction of their principal indicated that the program correctly identified teachers' needs as they existed when assessments were conducted, and that a serious attempt was made to meet these needs. Definite changes in teachers' behavior was a direct result of the training program. This behavior, although not objectively measured, was observable and identifiable. The reference here is to the fact that the teachers utilized their acquired skills in testing, organizing tests data, learning to make adequate interpretation of norm-referenced tests, and other benefits that may have resulted directly or indirectly from the workshops. It is true that most of these activities were monitored and encouraged by the trainer, but all signs indicate that given a situation where these skills will be needed, the teachers will apply them.

Is it advisable to encourage teachers to rely on standardized tests? The underlying assumption for this inservice program was that teachers have been relying, and most likely will continue to rely on standardized test data in making educational decisions. Therefore, any activity designed to promote a better understanding and use of such tests serves a positive purpose.

For more information, contact Nissim Shimoni, Triad Teacher Center, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC 27412.